

J. O. W. Ellister

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
Evangelical Repository.

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, AS SET FORTH IN THE FOR-
MULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES, AND OF THE
CHURCHES IN HOLLAND.

VOL. IX.

JANUARY, 1833.

NO. 8.

CONTENTS.

	page.		page.
The Thorn in the Flesh,	449	The visible Church the same under both dis-	
The parts of the Revelation that exhibit the		pensions,	498
Church in our own time, considered,	455	Of flattering the Ministers of the Gospel,	505
An Essay on the imputation of Adam's first		Interesting Anecdote,	506
sin to his posterity, (continued from p. 399)	463	Ability and Inability,	510
A vindication of the Scottish Covenanters,		Intemperance and Cholera—a fact,	512
consisting of a Review of the First Series of		Errata,	512
the Tales of My Landlord,	483		

Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way,
and walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls.
JAN. VI. 10.

EDITED BY A MINISTER OF THE ASSOCIATE CHURCH.

ALBANY:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY CHAUNCEY WEBSTER.
Two sheets—octavo.

J. O. W. Ellister

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
 AND
Evangelical Repository.

VOL. IX.

JANUARY, 1833.

NO. 8.

[For the Religious Monitor.]

"THE THORN IN THE FLESH."

2 Cor. xii. 1—7.

THERE have been two questions agitated respecting the statements made by Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 1—7. The one relates to the person spoken of, the other to the affliction or temptation of that person, called *a thorn in the flesh*. It has been supposed by some that Paul is here speaking of one of his brethren, who had enjoyed a wonderful vision, the particulars of which, he had related to this Apostle*. Their chief reasons for this opinion are, that the Apostle not only does not speak of himself as the person who enjoyed this vision, but distinguishes between this person and himself: *I knew a man in Christ—of such an one will I glory; yet of myself I will not glory but in mine infirmities*. He seems also to speak of this person as a former acquaintance, of whom he was now uncertain whether he were alive or dead. *I knew*, says he, *a man in Christ about fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body I cannot tell;)* that is, as they suppose, he could not tell whether he were now alive or dead. Yet though these and other things appear to favour the above opinion, there are stronger reasons in favour of that commonly adopted, which is, that Paul is here speaking of himself; and that he designs to be so understood, though to avoid the appearance of glorying, he makes use of the third person. On this supposition, his language is not more highly figurative than what is often employed, and hardly equals what is used by this same Apostle in describing the opposite principles of grace and corruption. In respect to both these principles he uses the language of denial as to his own personality. "Now then, says he, in one place, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me;" and

in another place, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." He may be supposed here to adopt the same kind of language for similar reasons. As in the one case, to repress the risings of pride in his own bosom, and set us an example of humility, he ascribes to Christ, all the good of which he had been the instrument, so in the other, to keep himself from being exalted in his own mind, or esteemed in the world above measure, he speaks of the visions and revelations with which he had been favoured as if not he but another had enjoyed them. He thus exhibits, by his modest manner, the practical advantage of his trial.

That the Apostle is speaking of himself, is evident from his design, which was to defend himself against those who rejected his claim to the Apostleship, and treated him with contempt. These persons appear to have been given to boasting, and probably made great pretences to extraordinary visions, and revelations. But how would it all answer the purpose of Paul's defence against them to relate the vision of some other person not named, and of whom it was not known whether he were alive or dead? In the 7th verse, he clearly applies to himself what he had said. *Lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me, a thorn in the flesh*. This view of the words agrees also with the history of the Apostle, who is related to have had several visions and revelations and probably many more than are recorded. His conversion was by means of a most remarkable vision of the Lord Christ. He saw also in a vision by night, a man of Macedonia calling him to go and preach in that place. In the ship, in which he sailed to Rome, he saw standing by him an angel of the Lord. And in his defence before the Jews at Jerusalem, he relates, that shortly after his conversion, while he prayed in the temple,

*Eders Annadversionses, Cap. I.

he was in a trance, and saw the Lord who gave him commandment to go unto the Gentiles. Some suppose that this last is the vision alluded to in the passage under consideration. But this is not probable, for in that vision the words of Christ plainly show that there could be no reason to doubt whether the Apostle were in the body or not. He must have been both in body and spirit at Jerusalem, and not in the third heaven; for Christ commands him to hasten out of Jerusalem; and again, he says to him, **DEPART, FOR I WILL SEND THEE FAR HENCE UNTO THE GENTILES.** The Apostle intimates that he had enjoyed many visions,—*an abundance of revelations.* He only gives an instance of one, and it may be a different one from any before recorded; one enjoyed fourteen years ago, but never before mentioned; and one which even now, he would not have mentioned, had he not been compelled to do it in self-defence.

The other, and more doubtful question arising from these words, relates to the particular trouble intended by the thorn in the flesh. This appears to be so generally given up as something inexplicable, that it may appear presumptuous to attempt any explanation. But though we may not discover every thing after which vain curiosity inquires, it does not follow that nothing can be known. It is also admitted that many who hardly think of solving such a question as, what they must do to be saved? will start a thousand questions about things which the Spirit of God has not seen proper to reveal, and busy themselves more in balancing the probabilities of different conjectures, than in meditating on the most important and infallible truth. Yet it is neither indulging, nor encouraging such a spirit to examine by their own light any question about the import of the Scriptures. We have no reason to think that any thing which the Spirit has revealed, is either altogether inexplicable, or when properly understood, unprofitable to the man of God. It appears very evident, that many of the conjectures, which have been advanced respecting the "thorn in the flesh," are not only unfounded, but capable of a decided refutation: and, though teaching what a thing is not, will not show us what it is, it will often help us forward to a discovery. Let us then first consider what this thorn was not, and then see whether we can make any discovery or approach towards a discovery of what it was. This thorn was not in itself a temptation. Though called the messenger of Satan; it could only have been so in the same way as

those afflictions by which Satan tempts us, for this thorn was *given* to the Apostle for his good. God gave to him in mercy, that which Satan devised to manage for his hurt: but God does not tempt men or give them temptations. Neither does this thorn appear, to have been any trouble coming on the Apostle from without, such as the reproaches and persecutions of enemies, or the unkindness and treachery of friends, seeing he speaks of it as being *in* the flesh, not against it, but *in* it, implying that it was an evil not coming upon him from without, but carried constantly within, something belonging to his own flesh. For the same reason it does not appear to have been any trouble of the spirit as distinguished from the flesh, such as care, anxiety, desertsions, and other things which afflict not the flesh directly, but only through the affliction of the spirit. This thorn does not appear to have been any corruption of nature, or propensity to sin, seeing these are natural, whereas this evil was unknown to the Apostle until after his vision: besides this thorn was given to him, and when he besought the Lord, he would not remove it, and the Apostle then resolved no more to lament over it, but to glory in it. He calls it not a part of that body of death, under which he groaned, but his infirmity. *Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.*

From these circumstances arising from this passage, and from what we learn elsewhere of the weakness of the Apostle's bodily presence, it seems at least extremely probable that this thorn in the flesh was some bodily malady. And from the fact that his speech was said to be contemptible, it seems also probable, that this malady particularly affected his speech. In proof of this opinion, let us now look a little at some evidence of a more positive character.

We find that visions have often had an overpowering effect upon the bodies of those who enjoyed them. It was commonly supposed in ancient times, that the sight of God would cause death. Thus, Manoah said to his wife, *We shall surely die, because we have seen God.* When Jacob wrestled with God, God touched the hollow of his thigh, and it shrank. When God appeared to Isaiah, he cried out, *Woe is me, I am undone, or, I am a dead man.* After the vision seen by Zechariah, he continued dumb till the birth of the promised child. Paul himself was struck blind by the sight of Jesus, when he met him in the way to Damascus. John, who had been so familiar with Christ while

in the world, fell as dead at his feet when he saw him in his glory.

May we not then suppose, that the vision enjoyed by Paul had been too much for frail nature,—that it produced some weakness of body and faltering of speech, and that on this account he was attacked by enemies, and despised by those who regarded more the letter, than the spirit of the gospel, and the manner of the preacher, more than the truth taught. May we not suppose, that this was one reason why so many of the churches which he had planted so soon forgot him, and were ready to disown him as an Apostle; and may we not also suppose, that this was the means ordained by Providence to keep him from pride, and to evince the truth of that gospel of which he was so convinced, that he could not but preach it, though his labours were despised, and though the more abundantly he loved men, the less he was loved? And would not this clearly show that the power of the gospel was not at all owing to the wisdom or eloquence of men; but entirely to the rich grace and almighty power of God; seeing one who had no arts of this kind to gain over to any cause, yet gained such multitudes to the cause of Christ? The Apostle gloried in his infirmities, because by means of them, though he was humbled, Christ was exalted in giving him support and success in his work. This view of the Apostle's affliction appears to agree better with the design of it than any thing else which could be supposed. Hardly any thing else could have been such a powerful and constant check to the pride of a minister as that which exposed him to contempt in his ministerial labours; hardly any thing else would have shown so clearly the power of Christ attending his work.

The Apostle also alludes in several places to a trouble of this kind, on account of which his enemies reproached him, and his friends were tempted to desert him; a trouble in his flesh which affected him in his ministry, and for bearing with which, he expresses himself with the liveliest gratitude to some of the churches. Though in other places, we read of ministers who, were eloquent; and of ministers who, for boldness and power of speech were called sons of thunder, Paul speaks of his preaching as altogether different in character. He tells the Corinthians, that he came not to them with excellency of speech or of wisdom. *I was with you*, says he, *in weakness and in fear, and in much trembling*. He notices what his enemies said of him, which appears to have had its foundation in some kind of impediment of

speech, and would hardly have been asserted even by enemies, among those who, if he were eloquent, must have been fully aware of its falsehood. *For his letters, say they, are weighty and powerful, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible*. And these assertions he does not deny, but plainly admits. *Though*, says he, *I be rude in speech yet not in knowledge,—Now I Paul who in presence am base among you, but being absent am bold towards you*. In like manner, in his epistle to the Galatians iv. 13, 14, he mentions this among other things which had encouraged him, and endeared to him the members of that church, that they had borne with his infirmity as a speaker; *ye know*, says he, *how through infirmity of the flesh, I preached the gospel unto you at the first, and my temptation which was in the flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Jesus Christ*. It is hardly possible not to observe such a similarity in these words to those under consideration, as to identify the trouble described with the thorn in the flesh. In both places he speaks of an infirmity which was habitual and peculiar to him above any other,—an infirmity which was *his*, and so well known and remarkable, that it was sufficiently described to those among whom he laboured by being mentioned as *his*. In both places he speaks of it as an infirmity and a temptation in the flesh, and as exposing him to contempt. These circumstances appear sufficient to prove that the Apostle is speaking in both places of the same thing; and the passage in Galatians may therefore be viewed as affording additional light respecting the thorn in the flesh. From what he says to the Galatians it appears that this trouble affected his preaching, and rendered it the more remarkable, that he should have been so well received, *as an angel of God, and even as Jesus Christ*.

From all this it seems probable, that shortly after the conversion of the Apostle he had been favored with an extraordinary vision, to strengthen him and prepare him for his work. He was either in the spirit alone, or both in body and spirit caught up to the Third Heaven, the habitation of God. He then saw and heard things which it was not possible to declare in words, and which it was not necessary for the church in her present state to know. And this vision which otherwise might have filled him with pride, as if he had been singled out as more deserving, and therefore, more highly favoured than all others, was attended with such dis-

plays of the divine glory beyond what his frail nature could endure, that his body suffered a shock, from which it was never to recover till changed and made like the glorious body of Christ. This shock had caused such a stammering of the voice, and such a trembling of the whole frame, that his bodily presence was rendered weak and his speech contemptible. For a time this had been a source of great affliction, partly owing to the remains of human pride, and partly to a divine zeal for the cause of the gospel, in which his work would appear to be marred and hindered. He had earnestly and repeatedly besought the Lord to remove this trouble, but had learned to submit to it, and glory in it as both for Christ's honor and his own good. By this means his pride was mortified, and the power of truth and riches of grace manifested in giving him support and success in his labours. The more vile the chosen vessel appeared, the more the riches of the treasure would be displayed. God chose Moses under the Old Testament to be the chief instrument of communicating his will, and he chose for the same purpose Paul under the New; and neither of them appear to have been eloquent. Thus, we have stronger proof of the purity of their aims, and their doctrine; and thus our faith stands not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God. It is common to make the eloquence of Paul a favourite theme, and not only to insist on it, as if it were undoubted truth, but as if it were almost essential to support the truth of the gospel. There is still much of that carnal spirit, which says, *I am of Paul*, which decides respecting the truth, and excellence of doctrines according to the gifts of those who teach them; which sets the testimony of man above the testimony of God, and the eloquence of man above the power and demonstration of the Spirit. *But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are; that no flesh should glory in his presence.*

T. B.

THE PARTS OF THE REVELATION THAT
EXHIBIT THE CHURCH IN OUR OWN
TIME, CONSIDERED.

In attempting this, it will be my plan to pass over those interpretations which I think incorrect, and state directly, the simple truth,

in as little bounds as perspicuity will admit. The first part of the book, that appears to me, to come under the designation in the title of this paper, is the seventh Chapter.

It gives a view of the church from the time that heathen idolatry was overthrown in the Roman empire, by means of Constantine, to the end of time. The SEALED ONES are the church, and the SEAL of the living God on the forehead, is the badge of the true church. From that time to the rising of the witnesses, Ch. xi. 11, and thence to the end of the world, she is described as tearing a *Palm*, (the emblem of victory over the beast) before the throne, and before the Lamb. The first of these periods extends to our own time, and beyond it. And before I consider the characteristic, which she sustains during that period, it will be necessary to show that the period *does* extend to our own time. To illustrate this a little, I would observe generally, that this period, and that of the witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, and also that of the woman fleeing into the wilderness from the face of the serpent, as mentioned in chap. xi. and xii., all end when the war with the beast ends. For all these three symbols describe the church in a *defensive* position, and as assailed by a common enemy, a corrupt and whorish church. That such is the common enemy of the witnesses and the woman, none I presume will question who have attentively read the xi. and xii. chaps. And the first part of the xiv. chap., shows as clearly that the enemy of the sealed ones, was also the same corrupt and spiritual Adulteress the Church of Rome, and her daughters, which on other accounts, are frequently denominated the *Peast*.

"These (144,000 sealed ones,) "are they which were not defiled with *women*, for they are virgins," ver. 4, chap. xiv. "Women" pretending to be the spouse of Christ; but in truth only Adulteresses. When this war is ended and this enemy overcome, then these *sealed ones* will receive the *Palm*, and stand before the throne a great multitude, singing a song of victory, as represented in the last part of this chap., and the first part of the xiv. But at the end of this war, the *witnesses* also rise, (see ch. xi. 11,) so that the two periods end together. Now, if it can be shown that the witnesses are not yet either slain or risen, it will also be shown, that the time of the *sealed ones* is not yet expired. In order to ascertain this point I would observe, that the period of the witnesses in sackcloth, and of the woman in the wilderness, which is a

time, times, and the dividing of time, or 42 months, or 1260 days, is commensurate with the reign of the Beast in his complex character as the 7th Head virtually of the Empire, the civil Head of his own dominions, and pretended Head of the Church, and they end together. (See ch. xi. 2, 3, ch. xii. 14, ch. xiii. 5.) When that period ends we may expect, that the Beast will, in this tripple capacity, of which his tripple crown is an index, cease to reign. In this complex head-ship, he makes his first appearance in the visions of Daniel, viz: as a little horn. (Daniel ch. vii. 8, and ch. viii. 9. This Horn was no doubt an emblem only of political power, or temporal authority as a prince, but then it is well known, that the Pope was acknowledged to be visible Head of the Church, or universal Bishop, some considerable time before he became a prince, so that he is both, at the time this little Horn appears. And it is to be particularly observed, that it is to the *continuance of this little Horn*, that Daniel applies the 42 months, (ch. vii. 25, also ch. xii. 7.) According to this, the little Horn, or the temporal authority of the Pope as a prince will cease at the end of that time. If then I am correct, this event and the rising of the witnesses, will happen at, or about the same time, and this is precisely what appears to me to be stated in the Rev., ch. xi. ver. 11, 12, 13. "The same hour" in which the Spirit of life from God enters the witnesses, and they stand upon their feet, "there was a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city fell—city, in this place, is the same which "reigns over the kings of the earth," (ch. xvii. 18, or which is the same thing under a different symbol, the 7th Head, which has in it *ten horns*, which it commands and employs any way it pleases, (ch. xiii., 1.) Now, the Pope's temporal sovereignty came up among these ten horns, and is one of the ten, and inasmuch as he came up last, he is the *tenth*, and is therefore, this very *tenth* part that falls. (ch. xi. 13.) But although his temporal authority is becoming weak and tottering, and some of his subjects are threatening to throw off his yoke; yet, he still has it, and also many powerful friends in Europe to help him to keep it. Therefore, the witnesses are not risen yet, neither are they slain, and consequently, the period of the *sealed ones* is not yet expired.

Again, in order to discover the time when this little Horn was to make its appearance, the Spirit of God, after giving a full account of his character, and conduct, sets down as

it appears to me, the very time when he *would appear*, (ch. xiii. 18.) Six hundred and three score and six. Reckoning this 606, from the time at which John received the vision, (which is a very common way of reckoning,) that is about the year 90, we arrive at 706, which, as far as can be known, is the year in which the Bishop of Rome was made a temporal prince by Pepin King of France. It is true, that this number 666 put together in the letters that make it, is in the greek Lateinos, and in the Hebrew Romith, or the Roman Empire; but then, this name will apply to Rome Pagan, as well as Rome Christian, or Anti-Christian, and so teaches us nothing more, with certainty, but only, that Rome is meant; a thing abundantly clear without this. Besides, to interpret it this way, is to make it a symbolical number, whereas, it is here stated not to be so, "it is the number of a man, a plain number, such as man makes use of in his common business, and not such a number as a Prophet uses, or is frequently used in the rest of this book. If we add 1260, the duration of the little Horn, to 706 we arrive at the year 2016; but as this 1260 is not the number of a man, but of a Prophet, whose year is only 360 days, which wants something over 5 days of the civil year, which amounts in 1260 to 17½ years, or very near 18, which subtracted from 2016 comes to the year 1998, or 166 years from this time, when the little Horn may be expected to fall—he witnesses to rise—victory to decide for the genuine followers of Christ, and these *sealed ones* will then receive the *Palm*, and their "great tribulation," (ver. 14,) will end. By that time, the church of God will have been in tribulation, labour, and travail for about 6000 years, then she may expect to enter upon her Millennial Sabbath. And to what else, does the days of the week, six of labour, and one of rest—the seventh year of rest, and release—the year of Jubilee—and the constant use of the number 7, as a symbol through the Scriptures, and especially in this book, refer, but just to this.

There are other illustrations, which might be brought to prove, that the time of the *sealed ones* is not yet ended, which will come to be considered in considering the character itself, and, therefore, I shall proceed to examine the first eight verses of this chap. Ver. 1, "And after these things, I saw four angels standing in the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that the wind should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor

on any tree." I acknowledge, that the *four winds* mentioned in Daniel, vii. 2, are a symbol for political contests among the nations. But in this place, they represent chiefly contests of a religious character, the erroneous and noxious doctrines, and inventions which *heretical* men were to bring into the visible church, and political events only, so far as connected with these, in the judgments of God or growing out of them. It may readily occur to any serious person, that the "servants of God" were not so ready to be "hurt" by those *political* winds that were to blow on the Roman Empire as by the "diverse and strange" "winds of doctrine," which came upon the church. But it is plain, that the *winds* here intended, were such as were every way adapted to hurt them and so much so, that their *not* doing it, can be accounted for, only by the invisible protection of this "*Seal of the Living God*." For, "if it were possible, they would deceive the very elect," (Math., xxiv. 24.) We have one particular view of these winds, and what they are in the first part of the 9th chap., under the figure of locusts, let out of the bottomless pit, who were permitted to hurt "only those men which have not the *seal* of God on their foreheads. (ver. 4.) That they do not mean the Saracens, is to me, put beyond all doubt, by the limitation put upon them, even as to those who had *not* this seal, in the 5th verse of that chap., "that they should *not* kill them." And that they were the propagators of false, and hurtful doctrines, appears equally plain from this, that they were authorised, and sent forth by the "Angel of the bottomless pit, a *fallen star*," (ver. 1,) which is the hieroglyphic for an apostate minister of the church, and in this particular instance, for the Bishop of Rome, after he had lost the heavenly lustre, as a minister of Jesus, the Sun of Righteousness, and become a carnal, earthly, sensual, devilish sort of person. Besides, on the supposition that these winds meant the political calamities that came upon the Roman Empire, it would be difficult to show, that the servants of God did not share as largely in these as others. They are represented to be *four* in number to warn the church of the fatal success, which these doctrines will meet with, and the wide extent to which they will be spread, even to every corner, or quarter of the world. And it may also hold forth to us, their contrariety one to another, as the North wind is to the South, and the East to the West. Farther, they are to blow with more, or less violence dur-

ing the whole of the period of the *sealed ones*, which makes it necessary, that the servants of God should be all that time under the protection of his seal.

The number four as applied to the Angels, is to be understood in a sense accordant with its application to the winds, that they also will be in every corner. I shall only observe, farther, on this verse, that although they are said to "*hold*" the winds, that they should not blow, they are not friendly angels; but the very agents that preach these soul-destroying tenets—"to whom it was given *to hurt*, (by way of permission in Providence,) the earth and the sea." (ver. 2.) Their "*holding the winds*," was *not* voluntary, but only the effect of that omnipotent restraining voice upon them, which cried, "*saying, hurt not*," (ver. 3) and which, although they are neither sensible of it, nor acknowledge it, sets a bound to them like the raging sea, which they shall not, through the long period of their blowing, be able to pass over.

If it be asked, what are we, in particular to understand by these winds, and what are the events in history? I answer, they are the same as the "Flood, which the Dragon cast out of his mouth, after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away with it." (ch. xii. 15.) This he began to speak, chiefly after he and his idolatrous worship and priesthood were cast out of the Roman Empire, and from persecuting the saints, which was in the days of Constantine, and chiefly by his means. This order of events will appear manifest, upon reading the 12th chap. And it was after this same great overturn in the Roman Empire, that John saw these four Angels holding these winds. For the last part of the 6th chap., describes it by such hieroglyphics as are common among the prophets for a revolution. And the 7th ch. begins thus, "*After these things*," &c., these just narrated. As to this "*flood of*" errors, and poisonous doctrines, I understand that it is a *casting forth*, during the whole time of the woman's being in the wilderness, and that she is also fleeing from his face, all the time; but of this, more afterwards.

If we look into history, we find that after Constantine publicly protected, and patronized the Christian Religion, Heretics became bold, and confident through his misapplied favour, and increased also in number. At this time, Arius came forth with his blasphemies against the Divinity of Jesus Christ. Shortly after Macedonius came out with his blasphemy against the personality of the

Holy Ghost. The Manicheans, begin also, to take root, and spread, who held two first causes, the one good, and the other evil. The Eutychians, also, who taught, that Jesus Christ had but one nature, a compound of the human and divine. Then the Nestorians, who went to the opposite extreme, and affirmed, that he had not only two natures, but also two persons. The Pelagians, who denied the imputation of Adam's first sin, and affirmed, that new born infants are in the same situation with Adam before he fell—that God gives us grace according to our merits—that the law qualified men for the kingdom of heaven, and was founded upon equal promises with the gospel. All these doctrines strike at the foundation. They were every one of them, the most deadly poison to the soul, and many thousands were poisoned by them. By this time, the pretensions of the Bishops, to preeminence above their brethren, was attracting the attention of the world, and the church. At the same time, superstition and pompous ceremonies were daily increasing, and supplanting the purity, and simplicity of gospel ordinances. And at length, the "man of sin" came to the birth, and the system of Popery was brought forth in full form. In the mean time, the "winds of diverse, and strange doctrine continued to blow." For next came the Semipelagian, who taught that God did not dispense grace to one more than another, in consequence of Predestination; but was willing to save all men, if they complied with the terms of his gospel,—that Christ died for all—that the grace purchased by Christ, and necessary to salvation, was *offered* to all—that man, before he received grace, was capable of faith, and holy desires—that man was born free, and capable of resisting the influences of the Spirit. Omitting many others, the Socinian heresy at length came forth, which held Christ to be only a mere man. Then, since the Reformation, has come forth, the Arminian system, which seems to be only the Semipelagian revived. And many of these heresies new moddled, and in new terms continue to this time. Thus, we may see, that the old serpent has made his flood chiefly to dash against the foundation, Christ the Rock; but it has dashed in vain. And who, that knows any thing at all, of the last 50 or 60 years, does not know, that new doctrines, and enactments of men, or old ones in a new dress, are more than ever, pouring in upon the church until like a flood, they threaten by their *number* or *quantity* simply to carry all before them. And when

we consider their incessant importuning of every listening ear—their moving eloquence—their cunning and craft, and the dexterous ingenuity, with which they can wear the appearance of truth, and the fascinating charms, which they display to a carnal appetite, we may certainly say, that if it were not for an invisible hand, that holds them, the very elect would be deceived, and ruined by them.

Ver. 2. *And I saw another angel ascending from the East, having the Seal of the living God, and he cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the "Earth and the Sea." (ver. 3.) Saying, hurt not the Earth, neither the Sea, nor any trees, till we have sealed the servants of God, in their foreheads.* In these two verses, there are chiefly two things to be considered. 1st. Who this angel is. 2d. What this sealing in the forehead means. The Earth, and the Sea, and trees signify *men*, and are chosen for this purpose, in accordance with the symbol in the first verse, "the winds." As the wind acts upon the earth, the sea, and trees, so do doctrines, on the souls of men. For proof, that men are intended, read chap. ix 4. If any say, that the earth means the Eastern Empire, and the sea the West; or as others, that the earth means a settled state of the Empire, and the sea a Revolutionary state; I shall not dispute about it. Both may be true, and would harmonise with the interpretation, which I have given, which I consider the primary meaning of the figure.

This angel, I take to be Christ. His "ascending from the East," seems to be spoken in allusion to his being called the "Light of the world," (John i. 9.) and the "Sun of Righteousness," (Mat. iv. 2.) or to what himself says to the disciples. "As the lightning cometh out of the *East*, and shineth even to the *West*, so shall the coming of the Son of man be." His having the *Seal* of the living God, will agree to no other, than Christ. For the *Seal* of the living God, is the *Holy Ghost*. So the Apostle speaks to the Ephesians, (ch. i. 13,) "in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were *sealed* with that Holy Spirit of promise." Again, (ch. iv. 30,) "grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are *sealed* unto the day of Redemption." In both places, this sealing appears from its end, to be the same with that in the passage under review, viz, the security of the persons. When the Holy Ghost is viewed as impressing the word of truth upon the soul, by his own Almighty power, there would be no improprie-

ty in considering him the *Sealer*. But again, when he is viewed as the Spirit of Christ, and as sent by him, into the heart, to take possession of it, in his name, as here, he may be considered as the *Seal* of the living God. It may help to strengthen our conviction, that this angel is Christ, the angel of the covenant, by observing, that it is *he* who performs the same, or similar work, (Ezek. ix. 4,) and if any doubt remain, it must vanish, upon considering, (ver. 1 of chap. xiv.,) of this book, where the person, that takes this care of these *sealed ones*, is called the Lamb. Neither will the authority, and power here exercised in restraining and bounding these angels, from *hurting*, agree to any other. And the *symbol* employed to set forth the exercise of this restraining power, at the time when these angels were carrying their hurt and mischief to the greatest height, puts it out of all doubt—"and he set his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot upon the earth," (ch. x, 2,) that is the certain doom of all Christ's, and his people's enemies. And the work of *Sealing* itself, will agree to none else. And this is the second thing in these verses, to be considered. First, this is done according to God's foreknowledge, and sovereign election of the persons as his. This seal is not put on any that is not his, in this sense, or, which is the same, in the sense of Christ, when he says, (John xvii,) "thine they were, and thou gavest them me." We have a confirmation of this position. (2d Tim ii, 19.) "Nevertheless, the foundation of God standeth sure, having this *Seal*, the Lord knoweth them that are his, and let every one that nameth the name of Christ, depart from iniquity." That is, to say, although some that made profession of the faith were "hurt" by the "wind" of Hymeneus and Philetus, yet none had been hurt, who had this seal. They stood upon firm ground. But who can use this seal? Plainly, none who has not the book of life, and therefore, none but the Lamb. Again, as this is the seal of the *living God*, so it makes a *living impression* upon the soul. Before, it was dead in trespasses, and sins. Now, it has the image of God impressed upon it, and the Spirit of God dwelling within it. It is united to Christ. It cries, like a living child, "Abba Father." This, also proves that this is "Christ our life," who has this seal. But, besides this secret, internal impression on the heart, this seal produces something *visible*. For what a man has on his "*forehead*" may be seen, and read of all men. And that consists of two parts, which God

has inseparably joined together. The one is, "naming the name of Christ," and the other is, "departing from iniquity," or which is the same thing, they are in profession, and practice "*the servants of God.*" This is at once, the character of the true Christian, and the true Church. Those who are content with profession, without "departing from iniquity," cannot be entitled, "sealed ones," or true servants of God. And those, who are satisfied with "a good heart, and a christian charitable practice, (as they are pleased to term it,) without "having the name of Christ" are just as little entitled to it. But it may be proper to consider these two things particularly. For it is not every thing, that passes current, under these *names*, that are truly these *things*.

Many, perhaps, the large majority at this day, will contend that they name the *name of Christ*, because they have confidence to tell fellow worms, that they have "*got religion.*" and have joined the Church, and partook of the Sacrament, yet, may they be as far from it as these *words*, which they use, are from being a *living substance*. Many use the name of Jesus, without attaching any distinct, or definite meaning to it. Others attach a meaning to it, which it does not bear in the scriptures. Neither of whom will be reputed to have named the name of Christ. The name of Christ, is a name, that stands for all the truth in the Old and New Testaments, whether prophecy, promise, precept, or doctrine, whether for personal and private application, or for the public order of the Church; because as the Great Prophet of the Church, he was commissioned to declare it all. If Moses and the Prophets, and Apostles spake at any time, it was in his name, and as the "faithful and true Witness," he hath solemnly put his name to it all, and sealed it with his blood. Therefore he says, "I am the way, the *truth* and the life." All the truth is said to be "in Christ;" and to be rooted and grounded in the truth, is to be rooted and built up in him. To preach the "whole counsel of God, and keep nothing back," is the same as to "preach Christ crucified." I cannot speak of every thing comprehended in that great and glorious name. But this, I can say, that it designates God, the second person of the ever ble-sed Trinity, in human nature one person, who, in the counsels of eternity, voluntarily *substituted* himself in the place of those sinners of mankind, whom God the Father was pleased, for reasons known only to himself, to choose to salvation—that in the fulness of time, he came

into tire world with the curse due to their sins upon him—that by the sacrifice of himself to justice, he did expiate their guilt—that his obedience to the law, and his enduring the penalty, being set over to the account of the sinner, and received by a faith wrought by the power of God in him, is the alone and *only possible* ground on which he is pardoned and accepted—that his blood through means of the truth, applied to every one, thus pardoned, by the almighty energy of the Holy Spirit works by degrees—works infallibly a complete, and perfect holiness in the soul, and that by virtue of his resurrection from the dead, every justified one, will be raised at the last day, to glory with him—that he has, in the scriptures laid down all the means of salvation—the only government of the Church, which he will ever bless—the only ordinances of worship, which will ever be accepted, through him before the throne of God—all the offices necessary in the church, and every thing that pertains to personal religion, and christian life and fellowship, so that he has left neither doctrine nor precept, to be invented by man. They who are endeavouring conscientiously, and in faith, to make public, and constant profession of a name, that stands for all this, and what is legitimately implied under it, do name the name of Christ, and have this part of the seal. They account every jot, or tittle of truth that can ever be found in the Old and New Testaments, so essential, and so precious, that it is a part of Christ's name, which is to them "as ointment poured forth."

To "depart from iniquity," is also more, than at first sight, many are ready to suppose. It is to mortify sin in the heart and affections, where it may be practised without any created eye to see, consequently, without the inconvenience, and the shame often attending upon open transgression, and where there is not any motive to mortify it, but because it is hateful to the *all-seeing eye*. This also, is a daily, steady practice. It does not go by fits, and sudden movements, such as these public and noisy excitements in our time, which go by various names. So long as the church, and the believer is in this present state, to depart from iniquity will be a daily duty, and a daily aim with every true follower of the Lamb. And chiefly, the sin that doth so easily beset them, which others would say, could not be helped at all, and that it was useless to strive against it, will they who are *sealed* strive *most* to mortify. All this hatred, and relinquishment of sin, they will evince in a

VOL. IX.

particular manner, by an open and faithful opposition to the public sins of their own time. With those that make defection from the name of Christ, they will neither sympathize nor symphonize. They will neither "touch, taste, nor handle the accursed innovation upon the gospel of Christ. Their hatred to sin, and love to Christ's name will be manifested precisely by carrying their opposition to *extreme* and *minute* points. What this wicked and adulterous generation hold in derision, they will justly consider, to be a *corruption* of the blessed name by which they are called.

That such is the *profession* and *practice* implied in this "*Seal on the forehead*," is established to be the meaning, by (chap. xiv. 1, 4, 5.) In this passage, we observe the same two things, first, a profession—"144,00 having his Father's name written in *their foreheads*;" and second, practice—"These are they which were not defiled with women, for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb, whithersoever he goeth—in their mouth was found no guile," &c. And it cannot be justly questioned, that they set forth, in other words, the very same two things—"naming the name of Christ, and departing from iniquity." I have said, that Christ's name stands for every truth contained in the Old and New Testament. This he declared to the church, as the great prophet, and attested as the faithful and true witness. But what Christ declared was his *Father's name*. "I will declare *thy name* unto my brethren," (Ps., xxii. 22.) "*I have manifested thy name* unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world" (John xvii. 6.) Therefore, the meaning is in substance the very same, and of the same extent. This is their public profession, and is the whole doctrines of salvation by free grace alone, originating in the absolute and unconditional "good pleasure of the Father's will, which he purposed in himself." This is the first, and great reason of their salvation, from his sovereign unconditional election of them, to their appearing in glory before him. In openly professing this, they express a glorious sovereign love that designates none but the Father. Their practice here described, is also substantially the same with "departing from iniquity." First, it is noted, "These are they, that were not defiled with women." (ver. 4.) Women here signify as I have already hinted, corrupt and backsliding churches, who have broken their solemn covenant, to be for Christ alone,

30

as their Lord, King and Lawgiver, their Prophet, and Priest, and have admitted the doctrines and commandments of men to occupy his place. That this is the meaning, may be clearly inferred from the character and station of these 144,000 on Mount Sion, which are here set in opposition to them. But if the reader has a single doubt, let him carefully read (Ezk chap. xvi. 23, Hosea chaps., i. and ii.) It is worthy of notice, that the plural is here used "Women," to intimate that they have to watch against more than *one*. Now, this self-same thing directly contradicts some prevailing opinions. For there are not a few, who will scarcely allow of any corrupt church, but the one church of Rome. But here, we are given to know, that besides the *abominations* of the Mother-harlot, they have to watch against the more sly, and cunning hypocritical whoredoms of the daughter-harlots, who call themselves Protestant Reformers—the name of chaste virgins. To give here an account of all their whoredoms, would be tedious. While some pretend to keep under Christ's name wear his clothing, and dwell in his house and sit at his table, they have their lovers. Others again have gone to the streets, and think no harm to take the *mother-harlot* to their table, and into their abode, if she would come. And others go a step farther, and peep into *her house*, and with an impudent face, tell us that it is not near so bad, as it was, and that it has been greatly misrepresented by the "virgins," at whom they point, with the finger, in scorn. But they all, (as all whores do) have tried their utmost to draw the *innocent* into their snare. For this purpose, they have used, and do still "use both deceit and violence." (Ps. lxxii. 14.) But the first of these means is, that which is now chiefly employed—"come with us—we are all going one way—we preach the substantial of your doctrine—there is scarce any difference," &c., &c.

These women have been, and *still* are the bitter enemies of the sealed ones. And their great danger of being "hurt," and ruined, as meant in the 7th chap., is just from them, and it is so great, that human wisdom oftentimes could neither foresee, nor prevent it. "Had not the Lord been on their side, they had been swallowed quick." But happy for them, he is on their side, and "constantly remains on it," (Ps. cxxv. 7.) notwithstanding their many slips, and ungrateful behaviour to him. While he sent his Holy Spirit to seal them, (Chap. iii. 2.) he himself, took his station by the

Golden Altar of incense, (chap. viii. 3,) that he might, without intermission, cry before the throne, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name, those whom thou hast given me, &c., (John xvii. 11,) and he sets his feet also upon their enemies, and as the "Lion of the tribe of Judah" roars over them with the voice of thunders, telling both to his sealed ones, and to them, that their destruction is inevitable, (chap. x. 1, 4) Besides all this, as the Great Shepherd, "he keeps them, he waters them *every* moment; lest any should hurt them, he keeps them night and day." (Isa. xxvii. 3) "And they shall be kept, and not one of them shall be lost." And when this battle shall be fought, and the victory won, he will read his muster roll, and lo, the number will be found entire, not one missing. He and they will have also kept their ground, and will not have given back an inch to the enemy. "Lo, the Lamb stood on Mount Sion, and with him 144,000! And while they are receiving the *Palm*, singing the song of victory, (verses 2 and 3,) he gives us a brief account of their character, and their spiritual bravery, and fidelity, during that great, long, and sore conflict, in which, is exactly defined what is at this present time required to make a true church. And those who have it not, however ill it may be taken, must be classed with Harlots. "These are they who have not defiled themselves with women," &c., (verses 4 and 5.) But the remarks, which I wish to make on this subject cannot be brought into the small room left here, so I conclude for the present, only, I would recommend to the reader, a serious, close, and prayerful investigation of these verses, and the first part of chap. 7th, as they, beyond contradiction, point out the duty of the present time.

[For the Religious Monitor.]

AN ESSAY

ON THE IMPUTATION OF ADAM'S FIRST SIN TO HIS POSTERITY.

(Continued from page 399.)

As we only intended by the exposition, given in our former communication, of the scope and argument of the Apostle in Rom. v. 12—19. to lay a foundation for some further remarks on the subject of Original Sin, we will now proceed to accomplish that intention. And surely, when we contemplate the many false and dangerous sentiments, which are now so universally entertained on this subject, it becomes us, as professed witnesses for the truth, to manifest an in-

telligent adherence to this part of the Church's Testimony.

The first step, which we will now take upon the subject, shall be to prove, that *Adam by a federal arrangement was constituted the representative of the whole human race*. If this position cannot be proved, the doctrine, respecting the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, can never be maintained. But if, on the contrary, this position be susceptible of proof, then the doctrine in question follows, in a measure, as a matter of course.

There are, here, two topics for discussion—*First*, the REALITY of a federal transaction with Adam; and—*Second*, the REPRESENTATIVE CHARACTER under which he appeared and acted in that transaction. We begin with proving the former.

That Adam, as soon as created, was placed under a law, can scarcely be denied. He was made in "the image of God;" but as one feature in that image was holiness, (Eph. iv. 24.) and as holiness is conformity to a moral law, it follows, that he was created under a law, which was the rule and measure of his holiness. He could not have been called *upright* or *holy*, had there not been a moral law written in his heart, in his very creation, with the requirements of which he possessed a perfect conformity. As soon, therefore, as he found himself a living creature, he found himself "under law to God." And, moreover, this law, under which he was created, possessed the force of a *covenant-law*; that is, it impliedly promised the bestowment of good, in case of continued obedience, and threatened evil, in case of disobedience. None can deny, that the moral law, as originally given to man, was sanctioned with an implied penalty, otherwise it had been unworthy of the name of a law. And on the other hand, that it contained an implied promise is plain from some declarations of the Apostle Paul. Speaking of this same moral law, he declares, that "the commandment was ordained to life," (Rom. vii. 10.) and again "what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh." (Rom. viii. 3.) Here he intimates, that there was something, which the law could once accomplish, before it became "weak through the flesh," or before man became so weak through sin, that he could no longer obey it: And what else was that, than the bestowment of eternal life, the very thing which embraced the design of the mission of God's Son into the

world? And our Saviour undoubtedly referred to the promise of life inherent in the law, as originally given to man, when he replied to a certain young legalist, "If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments." "Do this and live," is the natural dictate of the divine law. And indeed no law is deserving of the name, if it do not intrinsically possess the formal nature of a covenant. Even human laws do so; for, while they threaten punishment against their violation, they also impliedly promise governmental security and protection to their observance.

But when we speak of God's having made a covenant with Adam, we mean something more than this *natural covenanting*, to which we have alluded. We find, that shortly after Adam's creation, there was a *positive covenanting* transacted between God and him. "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (Gen. ii. 16, 17.) Now, that this was really a *federal regulation* between God and Adam, the transaction itself bears ample proof. Here,—

1. There are two distinct parties mentioned—THE LORD GOD, the Supreme Sovereign and Lawgiver of the Universe, and THE MAN, the subordinate lord of the lower creation. And the great inequality of the parties is no valid objection against their mutually covenanting together, when it is recollected, that the whole matter originated with, and was proposed by the superior party, and that too, in the way of manifesting sovereign condescension and goodness to the inferior party. There is nothing to prevent a master from entering into a federal compact with a servant.

2. There is a law given. "The Lord God COMMANDED the man." And this was a *positive law*, proceeding, not from the nature, but from the sovereign will of God, as it related to a matter, which in its own nature was indifferent, viz: the eating of a certain fruit. Now if the natural law, under which man was created, contained in itself the force of a covenant, much more may this positive law be regarded as a covenant-law.

3. There is a condition specified. The precise object, about which the regulation was made, was "the fruit of the trees of the garden." And, with one solitary exception, a free use of the fruit of all the trees growing in Eden was granted to the

man. "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it." And let it not be said, that this matter was too trifling to constitute an object worthy of a solemn covenant. Because nothing could have been a more satisfactory test of the man's obedience to the will of his Creator: which was the great object propounded by this transaction. Obedience to this one precept would have secured obedience to the whole moral law; and disobedience to it was disobedience to the whole moral law. "Whosoever offendeth in one point is guilty of all." Hence the immediate condition, proposed to Adam, was not so much *doing*, as *refraining from doing*. "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt NOT EAT of it." What condition could be more easy, considering the great object to be accomplished by it?—

4. There is a penalty annexed, as a solemn sanction of the transaction. "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." The evil threatened to be inflicted, in case of disobedience, was DEATH; and not only a *present* but also a *future* death: "dying thou shalt die"—one continued death, from the moment of transgressing to all eternity—involving a painful separation, not merely of the union between soul and body, but what is infinitely more terrible, a spiritual and eternal separation between the covenant-breaker and his God, accompanied with loss, shame, suffering and everlasting infamy.

5. There is a promise implied. Since death was expressly threatened as the penalty of disobedience, a promise, including the very opposite of death, must be inferred as having been made to a course of obedience. And as the penalty embraced the greatest amount of evil, the promise may be considered as embracing the greatest amount of good, viz: LIFE—natural, spiritual and eternal. And,

6. There is the consent of Adam to the terms proposed. By revelation he was made acquainted with the sovereign will of "the Lord God" in this matter; and being a truly intelligent being, he perfectly understood the nature of the whole transaction. And accordingly he communicated a knowledge of the eventful affair to the woman, whom God, shortly afterwards gave to be with him, and who also considered herself bound by the same deed. For, in the next Chap. she is represented as saying to the Serpent, "we may eat of the fruit of the

trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree, which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, YE shall not eat of it, neither shall YE touch it, lest YE die." Now this is enough to show, that there was actually a consent, on the part of man, to the proposed stipulation. For, being in possession of the knowledge of his Creator's will, as an upright and holy creature, he could not do otherwise, than yield a free, immediate and cordial consent to it. Indeed in his state of innocence, and while engaged in active obedience, his Creator's will was his will. And hence, when called to account for his disobedience, he does not plead that he had never consented to what had been proposed: on the contrary, the apology which he offers plainly indicates, that he had given his consent. "Hast thou eaten of the tree," says God, "whereof I commanded thee, that thou shouldst not eat?" And the man said, "The woman, whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat." Here he acknowledges guilt, but endeavours to palliate it, by laying the blame upon her, who was first in the transgression.

Now, from the foregoing considerations, it cannot, with any color of reason, be denied, that God did actually enter into a covenant with Adam. But the scriptures furnish us with many additional proofs upon the subject. Two only shall be noticed.

1. It is written in Hosea, (chap. vi. 7.) "But they like men have transgressed the covenant." With more propriety, these words may be translated, "But they LIKE ADAM have transgressed the covenant." The same phraseology occurs in Job, (chap. xxxi. 33.) "If I have covered my transgression AS ADAM." Here the first man, Adam is unquestionably intended. In the eighty-second Ps., we meet with the same expression—"But ye shall die LIKE MEN"—which clause would have been more forcibly expressed, and more in accordance with the scope of the Psalmist, had our Translators rendered it—"But ye shall die LIKE ADAM." But admitting, that the passage in Hosea is correctly translated, who would ever think of excluding Adam from "the men" to whom the prophet compares covenant-breaking Israel? And if he be included, then what covenant was he ever chargeable with transgressing, other than the covenant of which we are speaking?

2 In Heb. (chap. xii. 24,) we read of "Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant." This language suggests, that there was an "old covenant," of which Jesus was not

the Mediator. And what else could that covenant have been, than the covenant of works, which had been made with Adam? For, granting, that there is in these words a reference to the *new*, in opposition to the *old* testament dispensation of the covenant of Grace; still as Jesus is the mediator of that covenant, under both dispensations of it, and as there is evidently an allusion, here, to a covenant of which he was not the Mediator, we must conclude that the covenant made with Adam is intended. The Covenant of Grace, in respect of origin, is an "everlasting covenant," but in respect of revelation and execution, it succeeds the Covenant of Works; and in comparison with which, it receives the name of the New Covenant.

Thus, then, we have shown, that the Lord God made a covenant with Adam: and if any further evidence of this be required, it may be found in those proofs, which shall now be offered in the discussion of the *second* topic proposed, viz: that Adam, in this covenant, appeared and acted in the relation of a *representative* to all his posterity.

Adam, being the first man God created, was the "natural head" of all his descendants; or to vary the expression, the "natural root," from which they all sprung. But this is not what we mean by his being constituted the REPRESENTATIVE of his offspring. This circumstance, indeed, laid a proper foundation, and proved his fitness for sustaining a representative character, but was something entirely distinct from that character. Had Adam, in the covenant, been regarded merely as a natural head, we are free to acknowledge, that his descendants could not, according to our ideas of justice, have been charged with the guilt of his sinful conduct, however they might have suffered temporal evils in *consequence* of his conduct, as children, though not chargable with the sins of their parents, frequently become sufferers in *consequence* of their immoral conduct. But when we speak of Adam as a representative, we mean, that he appeared and acted in the name of his posterity, so that, in law, his acts became virtually their acts, they, as well as he, being held responsible for them. This remark, therefore, will shew the reader the bearing, that the fact of Adam's representative character has upon the doctrine of Original Sin.

Now, that Adam acted as the federal head and representative of his posterity, may be presumed from the fact of his being placed under a *positive law*. The natural

law, under which Adam was created, was, as we have seen, a covenant-law, and was sufficient to have secured him eternal life, in virtue of the implied promise of Jehovah. Why, then, was he put under a positive law relating to "the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil?" Was it, that his obedience might be more easy? This could not affect the facility of his obedience: For, being upright and holy in his nature, he could have obeyed God's law in every respect with more ease than he could have violated it. Indeed, no act of disobedience could have been committed by him, without offering resistance to the holy propensities of his nature. And admitting, what was probably the case, that the moral law could only be broken through this positive law, still we cannot see, how this could be any advantage to a perfectly holy creature, to whom obedience was more congenial than disobedience. The true reason, therefore, of this new arrangement seems to have been, that Adam might sustain a representative character, a character which he did not sustain while existing simply under the original law, given him in his creation; under which law he was only personally considered, acting for himself alone. And had no other arrangement been effected in relation to him, all his children would have been immediately and personally placed under the same law as a covenant-law, the moment they were brought into existence, and would have stood or fallen, according to their respective personal conduct. Moreover, when we consider, that Adam, when created, could have had no consciousness of standing as a representative of others, we see a very glorious propriety in God's entering into a *positive* arrangement with him relative to that matter. And that he might be constituted the representative, or moral head of his posterity, as he was created their natural head, seems obviously to have been the principal design of that positive establishment, relative to "the tree in the midst of the garden," and which is commonly called THE COVENANT OF WORKS. But we do not rest the argument upon mere *presumptive* proof. The following considerations, if duly weighed, must by every unbiassed mind, be regarded as *proofs positive* upon this interesting subject.

1. God's unerring word represents all mankind as having sinned in Adam. (Rom. v. 12.) The last clause of this verse, as we have already seen, may, with the utmost propriety, be translated, IN WHOM ALL HAVE SINNED. According, however, to the

common translation, the same idea is implied. The scope of the Apostle necessarily leads to this construction of his language. And there is nothing stronger in the expression, "in Adam all have sinned," than in the expression, used in the 12th v. "by the offence of one, (Adam,) many were made sinners." If many were *made*, or *constituted sinners* by the offence of Adam, does it not follow, that they sinned *in him*? And it is impossible to conceive, how mankind, being as yet unborn, could have sinned *in him*, had he not sustained the character of their representative and acted for them. An attempt, however, is made to evade this argument.* And how? Simply by denying, that the Apostle intends *all mankind*, when he asserts, that "death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." It is said, *adults* only are intended; and the reason why they die is, because they *sin actually*! But the word, which the Apostle uses, denotes *human beings* without any respect of *age* or *sex*. And if *all human beings* are not intended, the Apostle's declaration sinks into tameness, to say nothing worse. What a mighty Apostolical conclusion! WHEREFORE, AS BY ONE MAN SIN ENTERED INTO THE WORLD, AND DEATH BY SIN, EVEN SO DEATH PASSED UPON ALL ADULTS, FOR THAT ALL ADULTS HAVE SINNED ACTUALLY! But why lay it down as a *basis*, that sin and death entered into the world by one man, if he only intended to build upon it the fact so obvious to all, that *actual sinners die*? And why are infants excluded from the Apostle's "all men" that die? Do not they die? Then, why not let the Apostle account for *their death*, as well as for that of adults? He does account for their death, for the death of *all*, as the context abundantly proves, and that by declaring, that they "all have sinned." And since a very large portion of human beings that die, are incapable of actual sinning, they must have sinned "in Adam;" which could only have been, by virtue of his representation of them in the Covenant of Works.

2. Inspiration declares, that "In Adam all die." (1. Cor. xv. 22.) Now, even admitting, that it is a temporal dying only, that is here spoken of, this is sufficient to answer our purpose. For in what sense can all men be said to "die in Adam;" in a person, who lived and died before they were called into existence, unless that he represented them at the time, when death was first incurred by transgression? Nor can this conclusion be evaded, by saying,

*See Christian Spectator.

that the Apostle only means, that as Adam became mortal by transgression, so he propagated a mortal nature to all his offspring. Because the Apostle is not speaking of Adam as a *natural*, but as a *moral* head. He ascribes to him the same kind of headship, that he does to our Lord Jesus Christ. When he assures us in the same place, in regard to the resurrection of the just, that "they shall all be made alive in Christ," most certainly, he is not to be understood as representing the Saviour to be their *natural*, but their *moral* head. Believers "shall all be made alive in Christ;" that is, in virtue of their union to him, and on the ground of some *meritorious* act performed by him, as their moral Head or Representative. And this, we are assured, bears the most exact and striking similarity to the undeniable fact, that "in Adam all die," in virtue of their union to him, and on the ground of some *sinful* act performed by him, as their representative. The nature of the headship in both cases is the same; and if viewed otherwise, the aptness of the Apostle's comparison ceases to be obvious. If then Adam propagated a mortal nature to all his offspring, this, we contend, arose from the fact of his having represented them in that covenant, whose threatening was death—"In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" or as Eve expresses it, "Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." It must be granted, that if Adam, prior to the fall, possessed immortality of body, as well as of soul, that immortality was not absolute but conditional. Its continuance depended on his continued obedience. Disobedience to the will of his Creator would render him mortal; in that case, he would "surely die." Disobey he did; and accordingly he forfeited his immortality and became *deservedly* mortal. And hence, his offspring are also mortal in the same sense. Their mortality does not *necessarily* take place from the fact, that they are the descendants of a mortal. It is not absolute. Enoch and Elijah were *translated*. The last generation of Adam will not properly die. "We shall not all sleep." When, therefore, we are told, that "in Adam all die," the meaning is not, that all do absolutely and necessarily "die in him," but, that "in him" all became *obnoxious* to death, or *deserving* of death. And surely this involves his representative character. For, death, as we shall afterwards see, is in its own nature, a punishment; and a punishment presupposes guilt—hence, if "all die in Adam," it is because they are regarded

as having incurred death "in him;" which could only be on the ground of his having acted as their representative, when, by him, sin and death entered into the world. This argument is conclusive with all those, who believe with the Apostle, that "death is the WAGES of sin."

3. That Adam was a representative in the covenant, is evident from the special notice, that is taken of his "one offence." This *one offence* of Adam, the Apostle repeats again and again, in the passage before explained. Now why this particularity? Why insist so much upon that *ONE OFFENCE*? Why not attribute the evils, of which he speaks, to the offences of Adam in general? Or, why not rather attribute them to the offences of our more immediate parents? Surely our natural connection with them is more immediate than with Adam? The reason is obvious. When Adam committed the "one offence," to which the Apostle alludes, he sustained the peculiar character of a federal representative. But as soon as that offence was committed, he lost that peculiar character, and went back to the private station which he occupied under the natural law. And hence we have no concern in any of his other offences any more than we have in the offences of Noah, or any other individual in the line of our ancestry. If Adam then was not our representative, at the time he ate the forbidden fruit, what can the Apostle possibly mean, by speaking so emphatically of that *one offence*, and bringing all mankind under its baneful influence?

4. Adam was a representative head, otherwise he could not be called "the figure," or type of our Lord Jesus Christ, (Rom. v. 14.) But do the Scriptures attribute to Christ a representative or federal headship? Unless this can be shown, the present argument falls to the ground. The matter, however, is susceptible of the clearest proof. That a covenant was formed, in eternity, between the Father and the Son, relative to the salvation of fallen and guilty man, is evident. For, Jehovah, the Father, expressly declares—"I have made a covenant with my chosen; I have sworn unto David my servant" (Ps. lxxxix. 3.) Jesus Christ is here principally intended; for he is elsewhere called the Father's Servant, and his Elect, or chosen one—"Behold, my servant whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth," (Isa. xlii. 1.) And he is also called, David—"They shall serve the Lord their God, and DAVID their king, whom I will raise up unto them." (Jer. xxx. 9.) And again—"I will set up one

shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant DAVID," &c. (Ezek. xxxiv. 23.) Indeed Christ himself is expressly called a *covenant*; implying, that both he and all the blessings of his purchase come to be enjoyed by believers, in virtue of a covenant, of which he is the HEAD. "I will give thee for a COVENANT of the people, for a light of the Gentiles, to open blind eyes," &c. (Isa. xlii. 6.) Do we not also read of "an everlasting covenant;" and of "the blood of the everlasting covenant;" and of "Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant?" These expressions are calculated to mislead us, if they do not point to a Covenant of Grace, established, before time, with our Lord Jesus Christ. Besides, we have the express terms of this covenant mentioned in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. "When (IF) thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied.—THEREFORE will I divide him a portion with the great, (the great for a portion) and he shall divide the spoil with the strong, (the strong for a spoil) BECAUSE he hath poured out his soul unto death," &c. And corresponding to this, the Apostle Paul, when speaking of Christ's having "humbled himself and become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross," adds, "WHEREFORE also God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, that is above every name." This exaltation took place upon the performance of a condition, and as the result of a promise, and, therefore, incontrovertibly proves the existence of a covenant between Christ and his Father. And indeed the whole tenor of the gospel proves the same thing. But it is not so much the reality of this covenant, that we are now enquiring after, as the evidence of Christ's representative character in that covenant. And that he sustained this character, and still sustains it, is evident. Because—

1. A certain number of our fallen race is spoken of, as having been given to him, to be redeemed and saved. "All that the Father hath GIVEN me shall come unto me." Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he might give eternal life to as many as thou hast GIVEN him." "And I looked, and lo, a Lamb stood on the Mount Zion, and with him an hundred and forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads. These were REDEEMED FROM AMONG MEN, being the first fruits unto God and the Lamb." "Thou shalt call

his name Jesus; for he shall **SAVE HIS PEOPLE** from their sins."

2. Christ speaks as acting in the name and room of these. "I lay down my life for the sheep." "I pray for them." "For their sakes I sanctify myself," &c. And corresponding to this, the Apostle maintains, that "Christ loved the church and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it, &c."

3. Christ's people are represented as being his *seed* and the *travail* of his soul. "He shall see his seed." "He shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied."

4. It is difficult to conceive, how Jesus Christ, "the holy one of God," should be made under a broken law, and have obedience and sufferings exacted of him, if he were not really sustaining and truly acting in the character of a public head and representative of others.

5. He is expressly called a *surety*. "By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament," or covenant. A surety is one who undertakes the payment of another's debts. In law-reckoning, the surety and the debtor are viewed as one person. If the surety pay the debt, the law discharges the debtor, the same as if he himself had paid it. Now our blessed Lord has acted the part of a surety towards his people: he has paid all the debts which they owed to law and justice; and hence they become legally discharged. From this Christ's representative character is easily inferred.

6. We find him called by the same name by which his people are denominated. Thus he is called **ISRAEL**: But in what other sense, than that he is the representative of the whole Israel of God? Hence, we have his language, as originally applied to his own individual case, so interpreted by an inspired Apostle as to refer to all the elect. Thus says Christ, "He is near that justifieth **ME**,—who is he that shall condemn **ME**?" (Isa. l. 8, 9.) But says the Apostle, with his eye on these words, "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's **ELECT**?" It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?" &c. (Rom. viii. 33, 34.) And it may be here added, that not only is Christ called by the name of his Church, but they are also called by his name. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is **CHRIST**, (1. Cor. xii. 12.) But how can the church be called *Christ*, unless he be their representing Head? But not to multiply arguments on this point, we will only add.

7. That Christ's resurrection is plainly spoken of, as being that of a representative. In his resurrection he appeared as "the first fruits of them that slept." (1. Cor. xv. 20, 23.) Under the law, the "first-fruits" were offered to the Lord as a representation of the whole fruits of the coming harvest; and their consecration to the Lord was accepted and regarded as a consecration of the whole harvest. Christ's resurrection, therefore, was of a representative nature, and secured the actual resurrection of all his followers. But if Christ represented his people in his resurrection, he must also have represented them in his death, nay, in the whole of his mediatory undertaking and work.

Having thus proved Christ to be the federal representative of his chosen people, we can appreciate the force of the Apostle's words, when he asserts, that Adam was "the figure of him that was to come." All the types of Christ, spoken of in scripture, manifestly refer to his character and work as Mediator. Now, how could Adam have been a type of the Mediator, except by reason of his sustaining a representative character? Adam is no where called, either a prophet, priest, or king. He is not called a Mediator, as Moses was; he is not celebrated for destroying the enemies of the church, like Sampson; he was never in a whale's belly, as Jonah was. How then was he a type of Christ? View him as the representative of all his natural seed, as Christ is of his spiritual seed, and his typical character becomes apparent, the phrase under consideration freed from an unmeaning obscurity, that must otherwise cover it, and the Apostle's argument, in that place, triumphantly sustained.

5. Adam's representative character is proved from the comparison which the scriptures draw between him and our Lord Jesus Christ. This comparison is very particularly stated in the following words of the Apostle—"If through the offence of **ONE** many be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by **ONE MAN**, **JESUS CHRIST**, hath abounded unto many. If by **ONE MAN**'s offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by **ONE**, **JESUS CHRIST**. Therefore as by the offence of **ONE**, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of **ONE**, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by **ONE MAN**'s disobedience many were made sinners; so

by the obedience of ONE shall many be made righteous." What a striking contrast is here drawn between the effects resulting from the acts of these two characters! These surely must have been *public* or *representative* acts; for they involve the condition of millions. Here are sin, condemnation and death resulting from the "one offence" of the ONE; and righteousness, justification and life resulting from the "obedience" or "righteousness" of the OTHER! The Apostle also introduces this same comparison, in writing to the church at Corinth. "As in ADAM all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive," (1. Cor. xv. 22.) And afterwards, "The FIRST MAN ADAM was made a living soul, the LAST ADAM was made a quickening spirit." The FIRST MAN is of the earth, earthy; the SECOND MAN is the Lord from heaven. (Verses 45, 47.) Now, if Adam did not sustain a representative character, how is the Apostle, here, to be understood, in calling Jesus Christ "the second man," and "the last Adam"? In what sense is Christ the *second* to Adam, unless it be in respect of his sustaining a representative headship? And in what sense is he the "last Adam," unless it be that he possesses some distinguishing characteristic, which gives him a resemblance to the "first Adam," and which never will be found in any other? And what else can this characteristic be, than representative headship? Besides, these two personages are here presented to us, as each having a numerous body, or class of individuals resembling himself. "As is the EARTHY, (Adam,) such are they also that are EARTHY; and as is the HEAVENLY, (Christ,) such are they also that are HEAVENLY." (v. 48.) From the scope of the Apostle, these words, in their signification, are certainly to be considered as parallel to, and illustrative of those contained in (v. 22.) "As in Adam all die; even so in Christ shall all be made alive." And hence, unless Adam and Christ be viewed as representatives of others, it is difficult to conceive the reason why they should be singled out, in the manner that is here done, and the condition of all mankind be inseparably coupled with them, either for good or for evil. We think, therefore, that the conclusion is unavoidable—when the comparison, instituted in scripture, between Adam and Christ, is duly considered, and when it is also remembered, that Christ is, as was before proved, the representative of

the election of grace—that Adam in the covenant of works did really sustain the character of a representing head to all his natural offspring. To the foregoing proofs I only add,

6. That the same truth is proved from a consideration of the condition of infants. That some of the infant seed of Adam are received into heaven is a matter of certainty. For, says the Saviour, "suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not; for OF SUCH is the kingdom of God." But there are none received into heaven, save such as have been *redeemed* by the blood of Christ. The hundred and forty and four thousand, whom John saw standing with the Lamb on Mount Zion, were "redeemed from among men." Indeed if glorified infants were not redeemed, they could not unite in singing the song of redeeming love. (Rev. i. 5.) Now all the redeemed were, prior to their redemption, under the curse of the law, that is, under a broken law and subjected to its curse, or penalty. "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to REDEEM them that were under the law." (Gal. iv. 5, 6.) "Christ hath REDEEMED us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." (Ch. iii. 13.) Redeemed infants are, therefore, to be viewed as being originally under the curse of a broken law. How came they into that deplorable condition, a condition which rendered necessary a *redemption*, before they could be happy with God? They were not brought into it in consequence of their own sinful conduct; for they are incapable of sinning. It must, therefore, have been the conduct of some other that subjected them to the curse. And what other, but Adam? Do the scriptures point out to us any other? And if Adam, by transgression, brought all his infant seed under the curse of that law which he violated, it necessarily follows, that he acted in the character of their representative. The conclusion is inevitable.

Thus, then, we have proved, that by a federal arrangement, Adam was constituted the representative of the human race. And thus, also, we have paved the way for proving, what many, either ignorantly, or wilfully deny, the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity. But on this point, we shall not at present, enter.

(To be Continued.)

A VINDICATION OF THE SCOTTISH COVENANTERS, CONSISTING OF A REVIEW OF THE FIRST SERIES OF THE TALES OF MY LANDLORD.

It has been remarked, that one striking characteristic of the present age is a disposition to *worship genius*. And it appears that little respect is paid to the manner in which this idol has discovered itself, whether that has been for the benefit, or injury of mankind. Since the decease of Sir Walter Scott, the far-famed Novelist, the truth of the foregoing remark has received ample confirmation. In this, as in other countries, numerous meetings have been held to laud and reverence the memory of the man—nay, to *deify the genius* of the departed hero. And people of every rank and condition, good and bad, the saint and the sinner, the minister and the infidel, have united together and vied with each other in offering up incense at his shrine. That many, indeed, should be found as the humble worshippers of the genius of Sir Walter Scott is by no means strange; but that professed christians and especially Presbyterians, and more especially still Presbyterian ministers, should be found thus employed is more than a little surprising. When lived there a man, that ever did so much to corrupt the taste of the reading part of mankind, as Sir Walter has done by his fictitious writings? But this is not all; it is questionable whether any other individual ever did more to bring *religion* into contempt, religion as it appeared in its native beauty and simplicity in the characters and lives of the early Scottish Presbyterians. He has shown himself a bitter enemy to Scotland's covenanted work of Reformation, and has endeavoured by his profane wit, and sneers, and ridicule, to make that glorious work an object of scorn and contempt to all others. And his success in this unhallowed attempt has, no doubt, been great. And viewing matters in this light, we hazard nothing in saying that as an author he has proved a greater curse to the cause of true religion, than his countryman the infidel Hume. But God *who maketh the wrath of man to praise him*, used one of Sir Walter's Novels, as the occasion of drawing forth from the pen of that able historian, and eminent divine, Dr. McCrie, of Edinburgh, a most interesting work entitled, A VINDICATION OF THE SCOTTISH COVENANTERS, CONSISTING OF A REVIEW OF THE FIRST SERIES OF THE TALES OF MY LANDLORD. This work appeared originally, in numbers, in the Christian

Instructor for 1817. At the time it was written, the author of the TALES was the *Great Unknown*. But from certain allusions in the Review to some of Scott's poetical works, it appears that he was not altogether *unknown* to Dr. McCrie.

A Friend has politely furnished us with a copy of the above review, from which we intend to lay before our readers copious extracts. And, as a further Introduction to these "extracts," we take the liberty of publishing the accompanying letter.

"DEAR SIR,

To read the writings, and to hear the speeches of a certain religious Society in our country, one who was not acquainted with the history of the British churches would be induced to believe, that they and they only are the men, who appear in behalf of Reformation principles, as witnessed for by those faithful servants of the Lord, who shed their blood in the mosses, in the glens and mountains of Caledonia. But the mere name of "Covenanter" will not give us any legitimate right to lay claim for being the peculiar descendants of those men, to whom, under the blessing of God, we are so much indebted, unless we can prove that our principles are the same as those, for which those worthies contended. And I am inclined to believe that it is none of the best ways for establishing the "claim to the honour of descent from these illustrious martyrs and confessors, and of being their followers in the way of truth," by appealing to "The Tales of My Landlord, and the common consent of mankind."* Because I am convinced that neither the one nor the other is good authority to bring forward upon a subject of this kind. Besides, Sir, there are others, than those whom the name "Covenanter" is made to include, both in Scotland and in this country, "who continue until this day, witnessing both to small and great," for the true principles of the Reformed churches in Britain and Holland—these are the Associate Synod of North America and the Original Seceders in Scotland. These two bodies are *theoretically* and *practically* Covenanters in every sense of the word. These two Synods have lately engaged in covenanting, and many of their congregations have followed their example; while others are preparing to engage in that solemn duty.

I have made these remarks, in order to introduce to you (and if you think proper) to the notice of the readers of your eminently useful periodical, a book called "A Review

* Vide Evangelical Witness, Vol. iii. p. 483.

of the *Tales of My Landlord*," which, I believe, is not much known in this country. The Review is from the pen of the learned Dr. McCrie, whose works have done more to vindicate the character of the Reformers, and to wipe off the aspersions that have been cast upon their principles, than those of any other man now living. Those who have read his "Life of Knox," his "Life of Melville," his "History of the Reformation in Spain," his "History of the Reformation in Italy," &c. &c. will, I am persuaded, coincide with what I have stated. Now, Sir, this learned historian and able divine is a "Seceder," and one too who has taken a warm interest in the cause for which Seceders appear in this part of the world—many of those ministers, who in early times were sent here, being his most intimate acquaintances. Those principles contained in the works above-mentioned, as well as in the Review which I now send you, are the very principles for which Seceders appeared from the beginning, in opposition to those who embraced, from peculiar circumstances, new and strange notions respecting civil government. The Review of "The Tales of My Landlord," which first appeared in the *Edinburgh Christian Instructor*, was at that time particularly called for; because the whole country (I may say the whole Novel reading world) were greedily devouring every thing, good, bad and indifferent, which emanated from the exhaustless storehouse of the author of *Waverley*. But of all the notices and Reviews of those "Tales," which made their appearance, either in the *News-papers*, *Magazines*, *Quarterlies*, &c. no one dared to confront their author and grapple with him so closely, as did Dr. McCrie; for while he treated him as a scholar and a gentleman, he, at the same time, as an impartial critic, showed him, in several instances, his ignorance of the history of his country, his false views, or his designed misrepresentations of the men of whom he wrote, and of the period in which they lived, and his incapacity to appreciate their cause or delineate their character. The effect which the Review produced upon the thinking part of the religious public was salutary. Many changed their sentiments respecting the times, the principles, the sufferings and the deaths of those good men, whom they had seen shamefully caricatured in the infamous "Tales." And if I have been rightly informed (and I have it from good authority) Sir Walter himself was no little stunned to find, when every other was lavishing his praise upon him, that he was handled in

such a masterly manner by the *Christian Instructor*, a paper, whose merits were esteemed, and whose pages were read by the most respectable families in the kingdom. Now, if you think it proper to insert in the *Monitor* this Review, you will, I am certain, do much good to the cause of truth, and be the means of edifying the mind and encouraging the hearts of those in your own connection, and those that are out of it, who are proud of and love a "covenanted work of Reformation." You may expect to hear from me afterwards, when I shall present to your notice some other things of general interest. In the mean time,

Dear Sir,

I am yours truly,

J.

After a happy introduction, the author makes some general remarks on the first "Tale" in the series, entitled the "Black Dwarf," and then proceeds to his main purpose, to review the second, entitled "Old Mortality;" and having given a brief outline of the whole story, he proceeds in the following manner, at p. 13.

"This general outline is at least sufficient to characterise the class to which the tale belongs. It is by no means a story purely fictitious, but is of a mixed kind, and embraces the principal facts in the real history of this country during a very important period. The author has not merely availed himself incidentally of these facts; but they form the ground-work, and furnish the principal materials of his story. He has not taken occasion to make transient allusions to the characters and manners of the age; but it is the main and avowed object of his work to illustrate these, and to give a genuine and correct picture of the principles and conduct of the two parties into which Scotland was at that time divided. The person who undertakes such a work, subjects himself to laws far more strict than those which bind the ordinary class of fictitious writers. It is not enough that he keep within the bounds of probability,—he must conform to historic truth. If he introduces real characters, they must feel, and speak, and act, as they are described to have done in the faithful page of history, and the author is not at liberty to mould them as he pleases, to make them more interesting, and to give greater effect to his story. The same regard to the truth of history must be observed when fictitious personages are introduced, provided the reader is taught or induced to form a judgment from them of

the parties to which they are represented as belonging. If it is permitted to make embellishments on the scene, with the view of giving greater interest to the piece, the utmost care ought to be taken that they do not violate the integrity of character; and they must be impartially distributed, and equally extended to all parties, and to the virtues and vices of each. This is a delicate task, but the undertaker imposes it upon himself, with all its responsibilities. Besides fidelity, impartiality, and judgment, it requires an extensive, and minute, and accurate acquaintance with the history of the period selected, including the history of opinions and habits, as well as of events. And we do not hesitate to say, that this is a species of intelligence which is not likely to be possessed by the person who holds in sovereign contempt the opinions which were then deemed of the utmost moment, and turns with disgust from the very exterior manners of the men whose inmost habits he effects to disclose. Nor will the multifarious reading of the dabbler in every thing, from the highest affairs of the church and state, down to the economy of the kitchen, and the management of the stable, keep him from blundering here at every step.

Such, in our opinion, are the laws of the kind of writing under consideration; and we are not aware that their justice will be disputed, or that our statement of them is open to objection. The work before us we consider as chargeable with offences against these laws, which are neither few nor slight.

The guides of public opinion cannot be too jealous in guarding against the encroachments of the writers of fiction upon the province of true history, nor too faithful in pointing out every transgression, however small it may appear, of the sacred fences by which it is protected. Such writers have it in their power to do much mischief, from the engaging form in which they convey their sentiments to a numerous, and, in general, unsuspecting class of readers. When the scene is laid in a remote and fabulous period, or when the merits and conduct of the men who are made to figure in it, do not affect the great cause of truth and of public good, the writer may be allowed to exercise his ingenuity, and to amuse his readers, without our narrowly enquiring whether his representations are historically correct or not. But when he speaks of those men who were engaged in the great struggle for national and individual rights, civil and religious, which took place in this country previous to the Revolution, and of

all the cruelties of the oppressors, and all the sufferings of the oppressed, he is not to be tolerated in giving a false and distorted view of men and measures, whether this proceed from ignorance or from prejudice. Nor should his misrepresentations be allowed to pass without severe reprehension, when their native tendency is to shade the atrocities of persecution, to diminish the horror with which the conduct of a tyrannical and unprincipled government has been so long and so justly regarded, and to traduce and vilify the characters of those men, who, while they were made to feel all the weight of its severity, continued to resist until they succeeded in emancipating themselves, and securing their posterity, from the galling yoke. On this supposition, it is not sufficient to atone for such faults, that the work in which they are found displays great talents; that it contains scenes which are described with exquisite propriety and truth; that the leading facts in the history of those times are brought forward; that the author has condemned the severities of the government; that he is often in a mirthful and facetious mood; and that some allowances must be made for a desire to amuse his readers, and to impart greater interest to a story, which, after all, is for the most part fictitious. With every disposition to make all reasonable allowances, we are constrained to set aside such apologies. It is not upon sentiments transiently expressed, but upon the impression which the whole piece is calculated to make, that our judgment must be formed. We cannot agree to sacrifice the interests of truth either to the humour of an author, or to the amusement of his readers. We respect talents as much as any can do, and can admire them even when we are obliged to reprobate the bad purposes to which they are applied; but we must not suffer our imaginations to be dazzled by the splendour of talent; we cannot consent to be tricked and laughed out of our principles; nor will we passively allow men who deserve other treatment, and to whose firmness and intrepidity we are indebted for the transmission of so many blessings, to be run down and abused with profane wit, or low buffoonery.

Before proceeding to a particular examination of the characters which the author gives of the two parties, we beg leave to mention one or two instances, which go to shew that he is not to be trusted as to the accuracy of the statements upon which his judgments are pronounced. Lest we should be suspected of having hunted for these, we

shall take them from the two first paragraphs of his story. One charge which he frequently brings against the strict Presbyterians, is that of a morose and gloomy bigotry, displayed by their censuring of all innocent recreations. This he endeavours to impress on the imagination of his reader in the very first scene, by representing them as refusing, from such scruples, to attend the wappenschaws appointed by government. "The rigour of the strict Calvinists," says he, "increased in proportion to the wishes of the government that it should be relaxed. A supercilious condemnation of *all* manly pastimes and harmless recreations, distinguished those who professed a more than ordinary share of sanctity." Now, with respect to all that kind of information which the antiquary possesses, we will most cheerfully acknowledge the superiority of our author; and we can assure him, that we listened to him with "judaical" credulity, and with as devout gravity as any of his readers could listen to the sermons of the zealous Mause, or Habbakkuk Mucklewraith,—while he described, to our great edification, the poppingay or parrot, being the figure of a bird so called, with parti-coloured feathers, suspended on a pole, or mast, having a yard extended across it, as a mark, at which the competitors discharged their fuses and carabines, with the precise number of paces at which they stood from the mark, the exact number of rounds which they fired, and the identical manner in which the order of their rotation was settled: Also the ducal carriage, being an enormous leathern vehicle, like to Noah's ark, or at least the vulgar picture of it; the eight Flanders mares, with their long tails by which it was dragged; the eight insides, with their designations and rank, and the places which they occupied on the lateral recess, or the projection at the door, or the boot, and on the opposite ensconce; and the six outsides, being six lacquies, armed up to the teeth, who stood or rather hung, in triple file, on the foot-board, and eke, besides a coachman, three postillions, (the author has omitted to mention on which lateral horse they sat, or stood, or hung) with their short swords, and tie wigs with three tails, and blunderbusses and pistols. Truly, if the rigid features of the puritans did not relax into something of a more gentle aspect than "a sort of malignant and sarcastic sneer" at the sight of this moving mansion-house, we must grant that they were as morose and gloomy as the author represents them to have been. With respect to all information

of this kind, which the author takes every opportunity of imparting to his readers, with infinite particularity, and with such evident self-satisfaction, as to banish the suspicion, that he intended to set the rhapsodical jargon of modern writers over against that of the old whigs, or to shew, that, though the cant of hypocrisy is the worst, the cant of antiquarianism is the most childish and tormenting;—of the accuracy, we say, of all such information, we never presumed to hesitate for a moment: we are satisfied, upon his testimony, that in the sixteenth century it was customary for gentlemen of property to sit at the same table with the lowest of their menial servants, though we did not before know that this mode of promiscuous feasting ascended higher in the grade of society than the families of farmers; and we now believe, upon the same authority, though it cost us, we confess, some pain to swallow it, that clocks or time-pieces were then a common article of furniture in a moorland farm-house. But we must acknowledge, that we are not disposed to pay the same deference to the author's opinion, in what relates to the religious sentiments and moral habits of those times: we presume to think, that we understand these fully as well as he does: and with regard to the scruple which he imputes to the Presbyterians respecting the lawfulness of assemblies for a show of arms, military exercises, and manly pastimes, whether he received his information from pedlars, weavers, and tailors, or from the descendants of honourable families, right reverent non-juring bishops, lairds, or their hereditary game-keepers, we can assure him, that they have imposed on his credulity and good nature, (which if he had had his usual wits about him, he might have suspected from "the shrug of the shoulder," with which they could not help accompanying it) much in the same way that the "travelling packman," imposed upon Oldbuck the antiquary about "the bodle." The fact is, that from the Reformation, down to the period in which the scene of this tale is laid, such exercises and pastimes were quite common throughout Scotland; children were carefully trained to them when at school; professors in universities attended and joined in them, as well as their students; and the Presbyterian ministers, having practised them at school and at college, instead of condemning them as unlawful, did not scruple to countenance them with their presence. There were some of these precise preachers, for whom, we suspect, our author (with all his intimate knowledge of such sports) might not

have been quite a match in shooting at the poppingay; and in playing with them at the rapier or small sword, or in wrestling a fall, we are afraid he might have come off as badly as Sergeant Bothwell did from the brawny arms of John Balfour of Burley.

If he had not been eager to fix a stigma upon the Covenanters, he could not have been at a loss to account fully for their absence from the weaponschaws, without having recourse to this religious scruple. In the first place, the troops then kept up by government in a time of peace were intended to harass the Covenanters, and were wholly employed in discovering and dispersing their conventicles. As one great design of the reviews was to allure young men to enter into this army, we need not wonder that the Covenanters refrained from them, and inculcated this upon all who were under their influence. They refused to enlist, and they refused or scrupled to pay the cess which was appropriated to the support of troops raised for the express purpose of suppressing their religious assemblies. The author, according to his mode of writing and reasoning, should therefore have represented them as of the principle of those fanatics who denied the lawfulness of bearing arms, and of paying taxes for the common purposes of government. If it were necessary to assign any other reason, we might add, that the Presbyterians had a religious scruple, but one of a very different complexion from that which is assumed by our author. These reviews, with their attendant sports, were then ordinarily held on Sabbath-days. "Under the reign of the last Stuarts, (to avail ourselves in part of the language of our author in the pretty exordium with which he opens his tale,) there was an anxious wish on the part of government to counteract, by every means in their power, the strict or puritanical spirit." For this purpose, "frequent musters and assemblies of the people, both for military exercise, and for sports and pastimes, were appointed by authority" to be held on the Sabbath. This did not commence till after "the republican government." It was the English Solomon who, in his wisdom, first discovered this project for promoting the happiness of his good subjects. It was revived and pressed with greater zeal in the reign of his son, the pious martyr, Charles I., and again resorted to by his most sacred and immaculate majesty Charles II. To have stated this circumstance broadly would have tended to weaken the impression which the author wished to make on the minds of his readers, as to the

moroseness and rigidity of the Presbyterians; and therefore he keeps it back, or rather dexterously veils it. That he was aware of the fact is evident, not only from his charging the Covenanters, in this place, with "a judaical observance of the Sabbath," but also from his telling us, that, if present, they could not avoid "listening to the prayers read in the churches on these occasions."

With what indignation must he have read a late proclamation of the magistrates of this city, enforcing "a judaical observance of the Sabbath!" With what horror must he have viewed the hydra form of Puritanism, which was cut down at Bothwell Bridge in 1679, rearing its deformed head in 1816, and stalking the streets of the capital of Scotland in the shape of its Lord Provost and Magistrates! And, after this, how soothing to his perturbed spirits must have been the spectacle exhibited, so recently and so opportunely, on a Sunday, in one of the most public streets of the same city! If he was in the place, and not taking to himself a little innocent pastime in the country, our author doubtless must have been present on that occasion, dancing for joy promiscuously with the rabble assembled, and tripping it to the sound of "the pipe and tabor, or the bagpipe." His good friend, the memorialist of Lord Viscount Dundee, tells us, that his politic, as well as valorous hero found, that "his dragoons were the only medicines to be apply'd to their distempers," meaning the old fanatics; and there was no doubt something peculiarly pleasing in the resemblance (all danger being completely out of the question) between this and the recent incident. This is not the first time that Scotland has been indebted to her faithful and old ally, Russia, for assistance against a gloomy and unsocial fanaticism. General Dalziel was formerly brought from the wilds of Muscovy, as a falcon of the true breed, and trained on the proper ground, to hunt down the flying puritans, and to drive these impure and loathsome bats into their native dens and caves. And why should not our gallant officers have taken advantage of the presence of a Russian duke to revive the Sunday weaponschaws of former days, to teach our magistrates good manners, and to convince them that gentlemen in red coats are not bound to be subject to those rigid and puritanical restrictions which may be imposed on the vulgar?—We do not know what our author means, and we are not sure that he has himself any distinct idea of what is meant, by a judaical observance of the Sabbath. We know of no peculiar strict-

ness on this head exacted by our Presbyterian forefathers above what is practised by the sober and religious part of the inhabitants of Scotland to this day. Whatever he may be pleased to think of it, there are many, of as enlightened minds, and of as liberal principles as he can pretend to, who glory in this national distinction; and one reason why we will not suffer our ancestors to be misrepresented by him, or by any other writer of the present times, is the gratitude which we feel to them, for having transmitted to their posterity a hereditary and deep veneration for the Lord's Day.

The second instance which goes to prove that the author's statements respecting the religious sentiments and customs of that period are not to be depended upon, relates to the use of the Book of Common Prayer. "The young men at arms," says he, "were unable to avoid *listening to the prayers read in the churches on these occasions*, and thus, in the opinion of their repining parents, meddling with the accursed thing which is an abomination in the sight of the Lord." Now, though the author had not stood in awe of that "dreadful name," which all Christians are taught to venerate, nor been afraid of the threatening, "the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain," we should have thought that he would have at least been careful to save himself from ridicule, by ascertaining the truth of the fact which he assumes as the foundation of his irreverent jest. How, then, does the fact stand? Prayers were *not read* in the parish churches of Scotland at that time, any more than they were in the meeting-houses of the indulged, or in the conventicles of the stricter Presbyterians. The author has taken it for granted, that the prayer-book was introduced into Scotland along with Episcopal government, at the Restoration. We are astonished that any one who professes to be acquainted with the history of that period, and especially one who undertakes to describe its religious manners, should take up this erroneous notion. The English Book of Common Prayer was never introduced into Scotland, and previous to 1637 was used only in the Chapel Royal, and perhaps occasionally in one or two other places, to please the king. The history of the short lived Scottish Prayer-Book is well known. At the Restoration, neither the one nor the other was imposed, but the public worship was left to be conducted as it had been practised in the Presbyterian church. Charles II. was not so fond of prayers, whether read or extempore, as to

interest himself in that matter; his maxim was, that Presbyterianism was not fit for a gentleman; his dissipated and irreligious courtiers were of the same opinion; and therefore Episcopacy was established. As for the aspiring churchmen who furthered and pressed the change, they were satisfied with seating themselves in their rich bishoprics. Accordingly, the author will not find the Presbyterians "repining" at this imposition; and had he examined their writings as he ought to have done, he would have found them repeatedly admitting that they had no such grievance. But surely, (we hear some of our readers who have perused *Old Mortality* exclaim,) surely, the prayer-book must have been read in the churches in those times. The old steward of Tillietudlem is as familiar with the *commination*, as the most conscientious curate in England could be; and the butler is as well acquainted with the *Litany*, as if he had heard it every Sunday, Wednesday, and Friday. (Vol. II. pp. 40, 267.) Cuddie Headrigg, too, very wittily observes, that this, in his opinion, formed the only difference between the Episcopalian service, and that of their opponents. (Same volume, sixvint chapter, hunder an' fifty saxt page.) Honest Major Bellenden also vouches for the fact, and introduces it when he was very much in earnest to procure the life of Henry Morton. "He is a lad of as good church-principles as any gentleman in the life-guards. He has gone to church-service with me fifty times, and I never heard him miss one of the responses in my life. Edith Bellenden can bear witness to it as well as I. He always read on the same prayer-book with her, and could look out the lessons as well as the curate himself." (See the saame second volume, twalfth chapter, and there the three hunder-thrid and three hunder-fourth pages.) Nay, to confirm the truth of the fact, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, Morton was so habituated to the use of the liturgy, that, in a situation of great distraction, "he had instinctively recourse to the petition for deliverance, and for composure of spirit, which is to be found in the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England;" a circumstance which so enraged his murderers, they determined to precipitate his fate. (Volume the fourth, auchty-thrid and auchty-fourth pages.)

There is one fault in the work which all who have carefully read it must have observed. For the sake of giving effect to a particular scene, the author does not hesitate to violate historic truth and probability, and

even to contradict his own statements or admissions. Instances of this occur in some of his best descriptions; and they shew that though he has the imagination and feeling of a poet, he is deficient in the judgment and discriminating taste of a historian. For example, at the wappenschaw, with which the story is introduced, he makes the whigs to shout repeatedly at Morton's success, and to cry, "The good old cause for ever!" although every one acquainted with the state of matters at that time, must be persuaded that this would have been a signal for the soldiers to disperse the crowd, and perhaps to shoot some of the offenders instantly on the spot. No part of the character of Burley will remove the gross improbability, that a man in his circumstances would have engaged in a personal conflict with a soldier in an inn, which in all likelihood must have issued in his imprisonment, and consequently in his detection. We mention these instances, because, as related by the author, they do not convey any degrading reflection on the character of the Covenanters, but, so far as they go, exhibit them in a favourable light; and therefore we cannot be suspected of partiality in pointing them out as blemishes. Mause is a favourite character with the author, and out of her mouth he intended to pour the greatest quantity of his ridicule upon the Covenanters. Here, then, we might have expected consistency. But how does the case stand? Mause was an old professor of religion, and also an old residenter on the estate of Tillietudlem. She had long attended conventicles, but she had conducted herself quietly, and prudently, and inoffensively; for had she done otherwise, the zealous lady Margaret Bellen-den, who was accustomed to visit her, and to gossip with her for half an hour at a time, must have long before discovered her principles and character. But no sooner does she fall under the management of our author, than she becomes all at once frenzied, and *having lost the command of herself*, and being wholly possessed by the fanatical spirit of the tale, she not only incurs the wrath of the old lady, with whom she had been "a sort of favorite," but by her wild and uncontrollable raving, expels herself and son from every harbour, and exposes all who were so unfortunate as to receive her, to the greatest distress and peril. What must we infer from this incongruous and conflicting representation? That the conduct of the discreet Mause, previous to "the 5th of May, 1679, when our narrative commences," exhibits the genuine picture of the

Presbyterian character, as it existed at that period; and that the description of her mad behaviour after that period, is the distorted caricature of the same class of persons, as now presented in Old Mortality?

*Nec melius natura queat variasse colores;
En tibi vera rosa est, en tibi ficta rosa!*

But as we are not yet to part with our author, and would wish to keep in the best terms possible with him, so long as we must be together, we shall suspend the discussion of the points on which we are under the necessity of differing from him, for the sake of performing the more pleasant duty of pointing out some of his beauties. These are numerous; and all the blemishes which we have noticed, and may yet find ourselves obliged to notice, could not prevent us from observing and admiring them. It is true, that when great talents are abused; when they are exerted to confound the distinctions between virtue and vice; to varnish oppression and injustice, and to throw ridicule upon those who resist these scourges of society, they ought not to screen the possessor from condemnation and censure. He is doubly criminal; he sins in patronising a bad cause; and he sins in prostituting to its support those talents which, by the very law of his nature, he was bound to use for an opposite purpose. Still we cannot be blind to their existence; nor would we wish to overlook one instance, in which they are legitimately and laudably employed. That the general tendency of the work under consideration, is unfavourable to the interests of religion and political freedom, is our decided judgment. But we at the same time cheerfully acknowledge, that in stating his own sentiments, the author has distinctly condemned persecution, tyranny, and military oppression; and although he has laboured to expose that party who were most distinguished for religion and correctness of manners, and among whom, indeed, these virtues were then almost exclusively to be found; yet we are unwilling, simply on that account, to consider him as an enemy to religion, or a champion of profaneness. But whatever the moral and religious character of the work be, its literary merits are unquestionably high. The author always views nature with the eye of a poet, and his descriptions of it are uniformly vivid, strong, and picturesque. His dialogue is animated, easy, and characteristical; and is often enlivened with strokes of genuine humour, and flashes of true wit. We cannot say, that we find those profound views of human nature, and those nice dissections of

the human heart, which appear in the characters of the masters of fictitious writing, who flourished during the last century. They had studied mankind with the eye of a philosopher; their object was to delineate men and manners, as they occurred in ordinary life; and their chief art was exerted in inventing scenes in which these might be fully unfolded, and in forming them into one piece of historical painting, in which variety was combined with unity, and the deepest interest imparted to the subject, without the smallest violation of the limits of nature and probability. Our author, again, has surveyed mankind, not carelessly indeed, but with a curious rather than a philosophic eye: he is attracted by the singularities and eccentricities of human character; he endeavours chiefly to amuse his readers with an exhibition of these; and whenever they had fallen within the reach of his observation, and he was under no temptation to distort, he has described them with uncommon, we might say with inimitable truth, *naivete*, and effect. He never fails to "carry every point," when he brings on the scene a highland chieftain, a moss-trooper, an astrologer, or even a dwarf; a cunning publican, a simple clown, an artful waiting-woman, or a whimsical old housekeeper. The character of Niel Bane is painted to the life. The scene in the public-house is well described; and the character of Serjeant Bothwell is natural, and supported throughout—only we must observe, that, from his education and former rank, he is not a fair specimen of the rude and brutal soldiery let loose upon the Covenanters; and he always takes care to engross the conversation, and scarcely allows his comrades to shew their faces. The shrewdness and worldly sense of Cuddie Headrigg, are very amusing; and we must praise the sagacity of the author, in keeping him cheek by jowl to his mother, not to keep her within bounds, (for his presence is of little service that way,) but to divert the reader's attention, and keep him from wearying of a character that is overcharged and unnatural. In general, we think that the author is most successful in giving the portraits of those in low life. Here he has, almost in every case, produced a *fac simile*; so that we may justly apply the following lines, in which Martial praises the portrait of *Issa*, the favourite lap-dog of his friend *Publius*:

*In qua tam similem videbis Issam,
Ut sit tam similis sibi nec ipsa.
Issam denique pone cum tabella,
Aut utramque putabis esse veram,
Aut utramque putabis esse fictam.*

VOL. IX.

So true the likeness of the elf,
That liker is not Issa's self.
Survey together, then apart,
The child of Nature and of Art;
Or both alike you'll say are true,
Or both you'll say the artist drew.

On the score of common propriety, we must except the description of Goose Gibbie, in the first scene. We are quite sensible that the author found it advisable to make some sacrifice of his taste to that of a large class of his readers, whom it was prudent to please; but it was surely too much to record, with such tedious minuteness, and such marks of delight, the adventures and misfortune of a poor "half-witted lad," similar to those who give "infinite satisfaction" to thoughtless school-boys, gaping clowns, and giggling handmaidens."

[From the Spirit of the Pilgrims.]

THE VISIBLE CHURCH THE SAME UNDER BOTH DISPENSATIONS.

THE relation subsisting in ancient times between the congregation of Israel and the Supreme Being was very intimate and peculiar. They had entered into solemn covenant with Him, and He had entered into covenant with them. They had 'avouched the Lord to be their God, to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes, his commandments, and his judgments, and to hearken to his voice; and the Lord had avouched them to be his peculiar people, as he had promised them.' (Deut. xxvi. 17, 18.)—Accordingly God speaks of the Israelites throughout the Old Testament as *his* people, *his own* people; and they speak of him as in a peculiar sense *their* God. They were the depositaries of the true religion; had made profession of this religion; and were manifestly a church—a *visible church*.—They are spoken of as a church in the New Testament. "This (Moses) is he that was in the Church in the wilderness." Acts vii. 38. My object in this paper is to show, that *the visible church, under both dispensations, has been substantially the same; or that the general, visible Christian community is but a continuation and enlargement of 'the commonwealth of Israel.'* I do not mean, indeed, that there have been no changes: there certainly have been changes in circumstantial things. While the people of God were looking forward to a Saviour to come, they needed types, and rites, and bloody sacrifices, which have since, for the best reasons, been taken out of the way. Still, the abolishing of these things,

and the ushering in of the new dispensation, did not affect the identity of the church.*

1. The identity of the visible church under both dispensations may be argued from *the identity and perpetuity of the real church*.—The real church on earth consists of all the true friends of God existing in the world. It embodies all the true religion, the piety, which is at any time to be found among men. It is on all hands admitted, that this body has been perpetually the same. The real friends of God have always sustained the same relations to him, and to one another;—they have always belonged to the same holy family, and this family is the church. But if the *real* church has been in all periods the same, so has the *visible* church. What is the visible church? It consists of all those who, by a credible outward profession, *appear* to belong to the real church *appear* to be truly sanctified persons.—The visible church is nothing more or less than the real church *bodied forth, made visible* to the apprehension of men;—so that we can no more conceive of two distinct visible churches, while we admit the identity of the real church, than we can conceive of any thing else as *visibly two*, which yet *appears to be one and the same*.

2. Under both dispensations, the church has *professed the same religion*. No one can doubt that true religion has been in all periods the same. There has been but one path from earth to heaven—but one way of salvation by a Redemer. This religion is revealed and inculcated in the Bible; and the religion of the Bible is *one*. The religion of the Old Testament is not distinct from that of the New, like the religion of Brumha or Mahomet; in all essential points it is *the same*. But the Israelites were professors of this religion as truly as Christians are. The Old Testament was committed to them, and they professed to receive it and follow it. Both the Old Testament and the New are committed to us, and we profess to adopt them as the rule of our faith and practice. It follows, therefore, that the church, under both dispensations, has professed the same religion—the religion of the Bible.

This argument may be presented in a different light, and the conclusion derived from

it will be the same. The religion of the Bible consists essentially in its *doctrines*; but what doctrines does the church now profess to receive, which the church of old did not receive? What important doctrines are inculcated in the New Testament which are omitted in the Old? The New Testament, to be sure, sets forth the doctrines of religion with greater clearness, particularity, and force; but it would be difficult to show, except in matters of inferior importance, that it reveals any new truths.

Another part of the religion of the Bible is its *requisitions*; and in these there is a singular uniformity. The demands of the law have been the same, under both dispensations. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself."—Repentance, faith, submission, hope, all the holy affections towards God, and all the benevolence and kindness to man, which are required of church members under the Gospel, were as strictly required of Israelites under the former dispensation. Indeed those directions, which go to constitute *the discipline of the church*, are inculcated in the New Testament almost precisely as in the Old. The direction of Christ now is, "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault." Formerly it was, "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him." Lev. xix. 17. The direction of Christ now is, "If thy brother repent, forgive him." Formerly it was, "When the offender shall bring his sin offering, and in token of repentance lay his hand upon its head, the victim shall be slain, and he shall be forgiven." (See Lev. chap. iv.) The direction of Christ now is, "If the offender will not hear the church, but continues presumptuously obstinate, let him be cut off and become to you as an heathen." Formerly it was, "The soul that doeth ought presumptuously, and will not hearken to the priest, nor the judge, the same hath reproached the Lord, and that soul shall be cut off from his people." (Matth. xviii. 17. Numb. xv. 30. Deut. xvii. 12.)

Still another part of the religion of the Bible consists of its *promises*; and what better promises has the church under the present dispensation, than those which it formerly enjoyed? Indeed, are not the identical promises to *the ancient Zion* still relied on as valid, and as applicable to the existing church of Christ? "Behold I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands;

* John the Baptist and our Saviour preached, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Matt. iii. 2, and iv. 17. The phrase *kingdom of heaven* is used in the Evangelists in a variety of significations. In the places above referred to it imports, not the erection of a new visible church, but the introduction of the *New Dispensation*, to displace that of the ritual law.

thy walls are continually before me. Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and queens thy nursing mothers. They shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that I am the Lord. Isa xlix. 16, 23.

It is plain, I trust, to every reader, that the religion of the two Testaments is the same; and that the church under both dispensations has actually professed the same religion. Of course, in regard to its outward religious profession—its *visibility*, it has been the same church.

3. Numerous declarations, which in the Old Testament were made to the ancient church, are in the New Testament applied to the Christian church. For instance, it is said in the Psalms, "I will declare thy name unto my brethren: in the midst of the congregation I will praise thee." Ps xxii. 22. But from the epistle to the Hebrews we learn, that this is the declaration of Christ respecting his church. "Both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he (Christ) is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, 'I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee.'" Heb. ii. 11, 12.

It follows, that "the congregation" spoken of in the Psalms, and "the church" spoken of in the epistle to the Hebrews, are the same body. Again, God said of his ancient church, "I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people." Lev. xxvi. 12. The apostle quotes this language, together with other expressions from the Old Testament, and applies them to the church at Corinth: "As God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And I will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty. *Having, therefore, these promises*, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves," &c. 2 Cor. vi. 16—18. How could Paul represent the Corinthian church as *having these promises*, and as being under consequent obligations to cleanse themselves, unless he considered them as a branch of the same ancient church to which these promises were made?

In the following language God addressed his church under the former dispensation: "If ye will obey my voice and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." Ex. xix. 5, 6. In almost the same language he addresses his church

under the Christian dispensation: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people." 1 Pet. ii. 9.

4. The *prophecies* of Scripture clearly show that the present visible church is the same with the church of Israel.—John the Baptist predicted of him who should come after him, not that he should *destroy*, but that he should "*thoroughly purge his floor*." Matth. iii. 12. Accordingly the church was *purified*, but not destroyed, by the coming of the Saviour.*

Christ predicted that many should "come from the east, and from the west, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven," while "the children of the kingdom should be cast into outer darkness." Mat viii. 11, 12. What are we to understand here by the phrase, "kingdom of heaven?" Not the kingdom of glory, surely; for none of the children of that kingdom will ever "be cast into outer darkness." The phrase must denote in this place, as it does in many others, the *visible church*. And the prediction of our Saviour was, that when the Jews were ejected for their unbelief, the Gentiles should come and sit down in the *same visible church* "with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." In the parable of the vineyard Christ also predicted, that the *same vineyard* or church, in which the Jews had done so wickedly, should be taken from them and given to the Gentiles. "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Matt. xxi. 43.

In proof of the point under consideration, I might adduce numerous quotations from the prophecies of the Old Testament. Indeed all the ancient predictions of the ingathering of the Gentiles, and of the future prosperity and glory of the church, were made, not to a new church to be erected under the Gospel dispensation, but to the Zion of the Old Testament—to the church at that time existing in Israel. "The Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee, and the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Lift up thine eyes round about and see: all they gather themselves together, they come to thee: Thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side. Then thou shalt see and flow

* The period of Christ's advent is spoken of by the apostle Paul as "the time of reformation."—Heb. ix. 10. On the theory here opposed, this must have been to the ancient church a time, not of reformation, but destruction. Reformation necessarily implies a *continuance* of the thing reformed.

together, and thine heart shall fear and be enlarged, because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee; the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee. The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee, and all them that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and they shall call thee the city of the Lord, *the Zion of the Holy One of Israel.*" See Is. chap. lx.—There is no resisting the conclusion to be drawn from these and similar passages, hundreds of which might be quoted from the Old Testament, but by supposing that it is the *real* and not the *visible* church which is here addressed. But how will those who adopt this supposition interpret passages like the following? "The children which thou shalt have, *after thou hast lost the other*, shall say again in thine ears, The place is too strait for me, give place to me that I may dwell. Then thou shalt say in thine heart, Who hath begotten me these, seeing *I have lost my children*, and am desolate, a captive, removing to and fro?" Is. xlix. 20, 21. Will it be pretended that this prediction belongs to the *real*, as distinct from the *visible* church of God? Has the *real* church ever lost any of her children? Has any *real* saint ever fallen finally away? It cannot be denied that this and similar predictions relate to *the visible church of Israel*, and establish the fact, that converted Gentiles under the new dispensation are gathered into the same church.

5. The identity of the church under both dispensations is certain from *the declarations* of Scripture. The Apostle Paul teaches in the eleventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans, (v. 17—24.) that the believing Gentiles are grafted into *the same* olive tree from which the unbelieving Jews were broken off, and into which the restored Jews shall be grafted again. What are we to understand by this olive tree? Not Christ; for none who are truly interested in him are ever broken off. Not the *real* church of God; for the same reason. The olive tree represents the *visible* church of God,* whose branches are attached to it by a profession of godliness. From this, the unbelieving Jews were broken off. Into the same, the believing Gentiles are grafted. And into the same, the restored posterity of Abraham will at length be grafted again. Hence the

* Jeremiah, addressing the church, says, "The Lord called thy name a green olive tree." Chap. xi. 16. Of the church in Israel the prophet Hosea says, "His branches shall spread, and his beauty shall be as the olive tree." Chap. xiv. 6.

sameness of the church under both dispensations is in this chapter incontestably established.

In further proof of this point, I shall adduce but one passage more. The Apostle, addressing his Ephesian brethren, says, "Wherefore remember, that ye, being in time past Gentiles in the flesh were without Christ, being *aliens from the commonwealth of Israel*, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." Chap. ii. 11, 12. Does this form of expression necessarily imply, that the Ephesians were *no longer* "without Christ, having no hope, and without God in the world?" But it implies with equal certainty, that they were no longer "*aliens from the commonwealth of Israel.*" It is just as clear from this passage that these Christian professors were now members of *the commonwealth or church of Israel*, as it is that they believed in Christ, enjoyed the comforts of hope, or loved and served the God of heaven.

6. There is evidence from *fact*, that the church, under both dispensations, has been the same. During Christ's public ministry, his disciples were members of the *Jewish Church*. They attended the festivals and and other instituted services of that church, and "walked in all its commandments and ordinances blameless." After the ascension of Christ, we find them pillars in the *Christian church*. Had they in the mean time been cut off from one church, and gathered into another? And if so, when and how was this done? And what record have we in the New Testament of any such proceeding? In the hour of Christ's death, important changes were indeed accomplished. The old dispensation was abolished, the new one ushered in, and the church was purged of its unbelieving members; but the stock of the olive tree with its few green branches, remained the same, and into it multitudes were speedily engrafted.

In short, nothing can be more evident, than that the disciples belonged to the same church on the day of Pentecost, and afterwards, to which they belonged on the night when they ate the Passover with their blessed Lord. And from this *fact* it follows conclusively that the church, under both dispensations, has been the same.

I forbear to press the inferences which naturally result from the truth here established. It will occur to every intelligent reader, that if the church, under both dispensations, has been the same, then the *covenant* of the church has been essentially

the same, and *children of church members are entitled to the seal of the covenant now, as they were in former times.* The prevailing difference of opinion in regard to the subject of infant baptism, has its foundation deep in the constitution of the church, and will not probably be removed, until the claims of the Israelitish church are better understood and more truly appreciated.

(From the Volunteer.)

ON FLATTERING THE MINISTERS OF THE GOSPEL.

THOSE who minister to us the gospel of God, are to be 'esteemed very highly in love for their work's sake.' They should receive of our 'carnal things' a full supply for all their temporal wants, that they may give themselves wholly to the duties of their office. They should be honored for their talent and usefulness, and more than all for their devotedness and fidelity. But there is a meed of praise often awarded to them, which endangers their christian graces, mars their work, and ultimately comes back upon their hearers in direful injuries to their spiritual interests. We refer to the practice of giving extravagant commendation, and extolling their talents and performances.

Some professors of religion seem to have no enjoyment in religious meetings, and scarcely any motive for attending them, except when they are suffered to exult in the fervor, the eloquence, the style, or the power, of the preacher. When they retire from the house of God, they are vociferous in lauding the fine sermon, the excellent prayer, the finished style, or the musical voice. They have forgotten the momentous truths they have heard, the scriptural argument and the pungent application; or even these are remembered only to be admired and commended. Least of all do they retain the remembrance of the presence of God, the solemnity of his worship, and the awful bearing of the truths uttered upon their own hearts, and lives, and immortal destiny. God, and the soul, and eternity are forgotten; and they remember only 'the lovely song of one that has a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument.' The praise of the servant rings in every social circle; while scarcely a mouth opens in the praise of God; and only here and there one has gone to his closet, to smite on his breast, crying, God be merciful to me a sinner—to consecrate himself to Christ, or pray that the word he has heard may be spirit and life unto his soul. The habit of eulogising

the preacher is soon formed. The practice of one influences another. Soon, the more considerate are afraid they shall scarcely be accounted his friends, if they do not respond to the general voice; and it becomes the settled practice of a church to measure the value of public ministrations by their worthiness of high praise; and to utter their flatteries among themselves as the best evidence of their own devotion and interest in the cause of religion.

The practice does not stop here. It is not enough for your eulogisers to sound the fame of their minister among themselves and before strangers. The praise must reach his own ear. He must be told—with what nauseating directness and fulsomeness is he sometimes told—how wonderfully he preached, and how fervently he prayed; how christians were delighted—how great men were pleased, and even opposers filled with admiration. We have sometimes known this dish of disgusting flattery, this abominable idolatry of the instrument, sanctimoniously covered over with a frosting of apparent acknowledgment of divine grace. He was uncommonly 'assisted,' or 'strengthened;' nay, was 'full of the Holy Ghost.' This is altogether too much. If worship must be paid to the sinful and imperfect servant, let it come in its own name and appropriate character. Let not the worshipper glance his praises up to the Most High, merely to pass them down to the creature as their ultimate and supreme object. The Eternal will not share the homage, in which He is allowed but a subordinate part; but will reject it as impiety towards His throne. 'He will not give his glory to another.'

There are other ways of extolling ministers, besides that of direct oral adulation.—People sometimes act out their idolatry, by putting them into important stations, and devolving upon them special and honorable services, beyond their abilities or merits, and in preference to others better entitled and better qualified. The high fame of some men is their passport to such distinctions, when that fame has no other basis than the breath of adulation from a few partial and perhaps interested admirers. None are accounted worthy of engaging on public occasions, or of being called to "metropolitan churches," except those who are "known to fame;"—but fame, generally shallow in her judgment and egregiously false, gives in such cases but poor "letters of commendation."

Now, ministers are but men: and, owing to the peculiar trials, and temptations always

incident to their office, are more susceptible of impressions from such injudicious conduct than any other class whatever. Their whole living, their comfort and respectability, and most of all, their facilities for usefulness, depend exceedingly on the affection and esteem of their people. On the other hand, they must declare many unwelcome truths, reprove the iniquities of men, and break up the strong holds of their delusion. 'If they please men' by their compliances, 'they cannot be the servants of Christ.' Much wisdom and firmness are indispensable, to sustain and direct them through all these moral perils on the right hand and on the left. They are more assailable by flattery, than by any other of all the wiles of the devil. No temptation can befall them within the range of possibilities, so insinuating and potent as this. Most unhappy therefore is that man, who has fallen into the soothing embraces of a church, which is disposed to adulation.

If he 'lays the flattering unction to his soul,' he is most certainly in imminent danger, and nothing can save him but some painful reverse which shall be overruled to teach him humility and wisdom. Feeding on the praises of his people, he will fail to bring his heart and his work to a daily scrutiny for the approbation of his Master. Fearing to displease or wound such affectionate and devoted hearers, he will insensibly lower down the standard of truth and holy living, and perhaps insensibly deal out flattery in return. He must almost inevitably decline in his spirit of devotedness and prayer. He will labor for display, rather than to honor Christ Jesus the Lord. If providence or grace do not interpose to save him he will become a time-server, and his ministry barren.

The practice of flattering a minister is very injurious to his people, and to the kingdom of God at large. It originates in an alarming defection from the christian spirit; or at least in very mistaken notions of christian duty. When indulged and continued, it naturally gathers strength. It carries the flatterers farther and farther from the simplicity and humility of the gospel. It engenders a spirit of pride; for the people who can enjoy and prize a wonderful minister, will soon regard themselves as an eminent people. The parties act reciprocally upon each other, to dishonor God, while they give themselves and each other a factitious elevation. The proverb is eventually verified, 'Like people, like priest;' and both being lifted up with pride, are liable to fall into

the condemnation of the devil. The injured Saviour departs from the solemn assembly; devotion and spiritual action decline; the fire on the altar goes out, or shows a fitful flame, now and then fanned by the breath of unholy emulation. Ere long it is discovered, that the deity of their worship is but an imperfect man, and the devotees but stupid worshippers. Either the mutual flatteries are exchanged for mutual dislike and crimination; or the inflated object of applause, failing to receive his accustomed gratification, seeks another sphere, where a new display of his excellencies may be appreciated and extolled.

Ministers can avoid these slippery places, only by an early and resolute resistance—Let young preachers understand the dangers that surround them; and receive only those expressions of esteem and affection which the gospel allows, and which their talents and labors can permanently sustain. Let them early teach their hearers to adore God alone; and show in all their conduct, that they regard themselves but weak and unprofitable servants. If they glory, let them glory in their infirmities, and in the cross of their Lord Jesus Christ. If a weak brother or sister unadvisedly bring them a censor of incense, let them meekly refuse it, and teach the offender a more excellent way. If a more boisterous zealot or partizan laud their performances, let them give a stern rebuke, and hush the tempter to perpetual silence. A wise man, we are not sure whether it were Whitfield, was complimented as he left the sanctuary on the excellent sermon he had delivered; 'O,' said he, 'Satan told me of that, before I left the pulpit.' Another encountered a thoughtless friend on a similar occasion: 'Away with your fire,' said he, 'I have gunpowder in here,' putting his hand upon his breast. A humble and decided resistance of all such habits, will soon teach a people to give honor to whom honor is due; and to reserve that heart-felt esteem, which alone is desirable, to be expressed in friendly actions. And that minister is more useful and happy, who knows that his hearers esteem him highly in love for his work's sake, but who never hears it from their own lips.

INTERESTING ANECDOTE.

It is frequently remarked, that the most laudable deeds are achieved in the shades of retirement; and to its truth, history testifies in every page. An act of heroism, or philanthropy, performed in solitude, where no undue feeling can affect the mind, or blast

the character, is worth to the eye of an impartial observer, whole volumes of exploits displayed before the gaze of a stupid and admiring multitude. It is not long since a gentleman was travelling in one of the counties of Virginia, and about the close of the day stopped at a public house to obtain refreshment, and spend the night. He had been there but a short time before an old man alighted from his gig, with the apparent intention of becoming a fellow guest at the same house. As the old man drove up he observed that both shafts of his gig were broken, and that they were held together by withs formed from the bark of a hickory sapling. Our traveller observed further that he was plainly clad; that his knee-buckles were loosened: and that something like negligence pervaded his dress. Conceiving him to be one of the honest yeomanry of our land, the courtesies of strangers passed between them, and they entered the tavern. It was about the same time that an addition of three or four young gentlemen was made to their number, most, if not all of them of the legal profession. As soon as they became conveniently accommodated, the conversation was turned by one of the latter upon an eloquent harangue which had been displayed at the bar. It was replied by the other, that he had witnessed the same day a degree of eloquence no doubt equal; but that it was from the pulpit. Something like a sarcastic rejoinder was made to the eloquence of the pulpit; and a warm and able altercation ensued, in which the merits of the Christian religion became the subject of discussion. From six o'clock until eleven, the young champions wielded the sword of argument, adducing with ingenuity and ability every thing that could be said pro and con. During this protracted period the old gentleman listened with all the meekness and modesty of a child, as if he was adding new information to the stores of his mind, or perhaps he was observing with a philosophic eye the faculties of the youthful mind, and how new energies are evolved by repeated action; or perhaps with patriotic emotion, he was reflecting upon the future destinies of his country, and on the rising generation, upon whom those duties must devolve; or most probably, with a sentiment of moral and religious feeling, he was collecting an argument which, characteristic of himself, no art would be able to elude, and no force to resist. Our traveller remained a spectator and took no part in what was said.

At last, one of the young men, remarking

that it was impossible to combat with long established prejudices, wheeled around and with some familiarity exclaimed, "Well old gentleman, what think you of these things?" If, said the traveller, a streak of vivid lightning had at that moment crossed the room, their amazement could not have been greater than it was with what followed.—The most eloquent and unanswerable appeal was made for nearly an hour by the old gentleman, that he had ever heard. So perfect was his recollection, that every argument urged against the Christian religion was met in the order it was advanced. Hume's sophistry, on the subject of miracles, was, if possible, more perfectly answered than it had already been done by Campbell. And in the whole lecture there was so much simplicity and energy, pathos and sublimity, that not another word was uttered. An attempt to describe it, said the traveller, would be an attempt to paint the sun beams. It was immediately a matter of curiosity and inquiry who the old gentleman was. The traveller concluded him to be the preacher, from whom the pulpit eloquence had been heard. But no, it was John Marshall, the Chief Justice of the United States.

[From the Presbyterian.]

ABILITY AND INABILITY.

MR. EDITOR:—At the present day, when so much is said respecting ability and inability; and when the precepts of the Bible are so often appealed to in support of the assertion "that it is inconsistent in the Divine Being to enjoin any thing which we are not, in *every sense*, able to perform," it may be of service to the cause of religion to present a connected view of some of the commands, the petitions, and the promises of the sacred Scriptures, which bear upon this subject. Such a view will often furnish much that is edifying and consoling—will explain the propriety of commands being given to those who are unable, by their own strength fully to obey them—will calm the disquietudes of those who *feel* their own insufficiency and weakness—and will show us, from the prayers of God's people, that they, in all ages, have been conscious of their inability, and felt their need of aid, from on high. The texts which follow are taken chiefly from a collection drawn up some years ago by Mr. Wilkes, of London in his "Scripture Harmony," a little work of which but few copies have crossed the Atlantic. In each of the following instances, we have 1. A command. 2. A supplication for aid. And 3. A direct promise of that aid.

Ezek. 18. 31: Make you a new heart, and a new spirit.

Ps. 51. 10: Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me.

Ezek. 36. 26: A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you.

1. Cor. 6. 7: Purge out the old leaven, &c.

Ps. 51. 7: Purge me with hyssop, &c.

Is. 1. 25: I will purge away thy dross, &c.

Ezek. 33. 11: Turn ye from your evil ways, &c.

Jer. 31. 18: Turn thou me and I shall be turned.

Rom. 11. 26: There shall come out of Zion a deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.

Amos, 4. 21: Prepare to meet thy God, &c.

1. Chron. 29. 18: Prepare their hearts unto thee.

Ps. 10. 17: Thou wilt prepare their heart, &c.

Eph. 5. 14: Awake thou that sleepest, &c.

Ps. 119. 25: Quicken thou me, &c.

John 5. 25: The dead shall hear my voice.

Job. 22. 22: Receive the law, from his mouth.

Ps. 119. 36: Incline mine heart unto thy testimonies.

Jer. 31. 33: I will write my law in their hearts, &c.

Acts, 16. 31: Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.

Mark, 9. 24: Help thou mine unbelief, &c.

Zeph. 3. 12: They shall trust in the name of the Lord.

Acts, 2. 40: Save yourselves, &c.

Jer. 17. 14: Save me, and I shall be saved.

Is. 45. 17: Israel shall be saved, &c.

Is. 1. 16: Wash you, make you clean.

Ps. 51. 2: Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, &c.

Ezek. 36. 25: I will sprinkle, &c.—and from all your idols will I cleanse you.

Ezek. 18. 31: Cast away all your transgressions.

Hosea, 14. 2: Take away all iniquity.

Is. 6. 7: Their iniquity is taken away.

Mat. 11. 38: Come unto me, all ye that labour.

Cant, 1. 4: Draw me—we will run after thee.

John, 6. 37: All that the Father giveth me shall come to me.

Rom. 6. 12: Let not sin reign in you, &c.

Ps. 19. 13: Keep back thy servant, also from presumptuous sins.

Rom. 6. 14: Sin shall not have dominion over you, &c.

Mark. 14. 38: Watch and pray, lest ye enter into temptation.

Matt. 6. 13: Lead us not into temptation.

1 Cor. 10. 13: He will not suffer you to be tempted, &c.

INTEMPERANCE AND CHOLERA—A FACT.

THE following account may be relied on as authentic, incredible as it may appear. While the cholera was prevailing in one of our lake villages a few weeks since, a lake captain who had just come into port, went to a public house, and, to show that he was not to be debared the use of the good creature by the whim that it was an ally of cholera, stepped to the bar, and demanded, in a boisterous tone, "a gill of cholera." It was given him, and he drank it. At the same time, one of his fellow captains lay dying with cholera. He went to the dying man, knowing him to be such, took hold of him and shook him, saying to him in sport, "Tell the old fellow that I shall be along soon; I shall come next." The wretched man was immediately seized with the disease, and died, in the utmost agony, in a few hours.—(*Hudson's Obs. and Tel.*)

ERRATA.

WE owe an apology to our correspondents for the typographical errors which occasionally appear in their communications. These generally are of such a nature as to be easily corrected by the reader. In a few instances, however, the meaning of the writer has been marred by their occurrence. Thus in our last No. in some unaccountable manner, the word "curiously" instead of "concisely" appears in the paper on "Divine Love," page 411. line 29. In the communications of the same writer some other palpable blunders have at different times occurred—as in the Oct. No. for 1831. p. 259. line 33. from the top, the word "nine" instead of "none" is printed. And in the Sept. No. for 1832. p. 211. line 23. from the top, the word "desire" should read "design." We hope our readers will pardon these mistakes, as well as our correspondents, while we promise greater attention to the typography of the Monitor.

NOTICE TO PATRONS.

Communications, Subscriptions for the work, and remittances of money, should be addressed either to the subscriber, or to the Rev. JAMES MARTIN.

Persons visiting the City, and wishing to pay their subscriptions, can, in the absence of the subscriber, pay them to Mr. ANDREW WHITE, at the old stand, No. 71 State-street, who is authorised to receive money for the Monitor and give receipts.

CHAUNCEY WEBSTER.

Albany, N. Y. June, 1832.

TERMS \$2 00 per annum, payable in advance or at the annual meeting of the Associate Synod:

¶ To PATRONS, AGENTS, &c.—As there is to be no meeting of Synod till next October, and as the present volume will be completed in May next, it becomes necessary for us to request subscribers and agents, to forward as much money as they can conveniently, either for the present or any previous volume not already paid, *by mail*, between this time and the 1st of May next, that we may be enabled to meet our engagements with the printer, &c. It is believed unnecessary to urge this matter, to insure a compliance with the above request.

¶ Money may be forwarded, *by mail*, at our risk, and at our expense, where more than \$5,00 is inclosed.

ALBANY, Dec. 1832.

AGENTS.

¶ All ministers and preachers of the Associate Church.

In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of the Associate church, who are authorized to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as agents:

Wm. Stevenson, Jun., Cambridge, Washington Co. N. Y.
Joseph M'Clelland, New-York City.
George M'Queen, Esq. Schenectady.
A. Bachop, Argyle, Washington Co. N. Y.
Wm. Dickey, Pittsburgh, Pa.
John Smart, Huntingdon, Pa.

Wm. M. Goodwillie, Barnet, Vt.
Rev. A. Whyte, Jr., Baltimore, Md.
Andrew Munro, Canonsburgh, Pa.
John M'Cleary, York, Livingston Co. N. Y.
Thomas Cummings, Putnam, Wash. Co. N. Y.
James Galloway, Jr., Xenia, Ohio.
James Willson, Esq. Oxford, Pa.

Subscribers in Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri, are requested to make payment to the Synod's Missionaries, who will also receive and forward the names of new subscribers.

A number of extra copies of the 9th volume are being printed under the expectation that they will be called for.